

The Selected Works of
MAULANA
ABUL KALAM AZAD

Volume XI

(1957-58)

Chief Editor

DR. RAVINDRA KUMAR

ATLANTIC PUBLISHERS AND DISTRIBUTORS

Preface

Dr. Shri Ravindra Kumar is an admirer of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. This is nothing unusual. Maulana Azad had numerous admirers in the course of India's struggle for freedom. The number increased appreciably after India attained freedom. Partition of India was the heavy price India paid for this freedom. Maulana Azad had throughout his whole political life opposed forces which encouraged separatist trends in our national life. It was in the partitioned India that people realised more vividly the soundness of the views Maulana had expressed on the communal problem.

Maulana Azad was among the major figures in our unique struggle for freedom waged under the leadership of Gandhiji. The Selected Works which Dr. Ravindra Kumar has edited bring out the greatness of Maulana Azad in several fields of life. He was most assuredly an outstanding scholar, a great journalist, a matchless orator but with equal ease he was also a great statesman who played a significant role in every crisis which India and, in particular, the Indian National Congress, faced from time to time in its struggle to make our country free and independent.

He had also his due share in shaping India's destiny in her first decade of Independence. He was an outstanding member of the union cabinet but what was more important was the mature advice he made available to his comrade and fellow warrior Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as the latter sought to grapple with India's difficult and daunting problems in the first crucial phase of her independence.

Dr. Ravindra Kumar may not yet be a mature scholar but the enthusiasm he has shown in portraying the intellectual and political life of Maulana Azad deserves commendation. The country is still faced with problems which greatly exercised the Maulana's mind. What he thought and said on these problems would still be a source of inspiration and enlightenment to his countrymen in the difficult days through which we are all passing.

Sadiq Ali

Introduction

This is the XIth Volume (1957-1958) of Selected Works of Maulana Azad (1936-1958). It includes his work in Parliament as Minister in the Government of India. In this Volume we find his views on Indian education system and Indian culture and his efforts to give a practical shape to this thinking.

Maulana was a firm believer of Gandhian Basic Education and he made efforts to make it more meaningful. He endeavoured to form policies on science, industry, literature and arts and music, and employment-oriented education.

This Volume covers, besides his Parliamentary work, some important documents of the period 1913 to 1956 which were left out in the previous Volumes. These have been included in part Three, Four and Appendices of this Volume. These documents are useful to research scholars, historians, political scientists and the general public.

An important document not related to the period covered in this series has also been appended in this Volume. I am confident that the readers will appreciate this Volume.

I am grateful to the staff of National Archives of India specially to its Director General, Dr. R.K. Parti and Assistant Director Shri P.R. Malik, Mrs. Meena Kapoor, Mrs. Manju Sehgal, Shri Pramod Mehra and Shri N.P. Sharma, President Shri Sadiq Ali and other staff of Gandhi National Museum and Library, Rajghat, New Delhi, Dr. Ravindra Kumar, Director and Dr. Hari Dev Sharma, Deputy Director, Shri A.K. Awasthi and others of Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, Teen Murti House, New Delhi, Librarian and other staff of Parliament Library, Sansad Bhavan, New Delhi, official and staff of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel National Memorial and Navjivan Trust, Ahmedabad and staff and officials of Kakasaheb Gadgil Pratishthan, Pune, for providing me important literature in their possession.

I am greatly indebted to His Excellency, Hon'ble Dr. Shankar Dayal Sharma, Vice-President of India, Hon'ble Shri Shivraj V. Patil, Speaker, Lok Sabha, His Holiness, Maulana Syed Abul Hasan Ali Nadvi, Rector, Nadwatul Ulama, Lucknow, Hon'ble Dr. (Mrs.) Najma Heptulla, Deputy Chairperson, Rajya Sabha, His Excellency, Hon'ble

Shri B. Satya Narayan Reddy, Governor of U.P., Dr. Karan Singh, Dr. Akbar Ali Khan and other officials of Abul Kalam Azad Oriental Research Institute, Public Gardens, Hyderabad, Shri Babubhai Jashbhai Patel, Shri V.N. Gadgil, Shri Hitendra Desai, Shri Jitendra Thakorebhai Desai, Com. E.M.S. Namboodiripad, Shri Nathubhai Naranji Naik, Shri A.J. Jalali, Shri S.G. Mohiuddin, Mrs. Kamlesh Ravindra Kumar, Dr. Malti Malik, Prof. K.L. Malik and others for their kind encouragement, guidance and co-operation in many ways in preparation of this Volume.

My special thanks are due to Dr. K.R. Gupta and Shri Manish Kumar Gupta of Atlantic Publishers and Distributors for undertaking the publication of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad's works courageously.

— RAVINDRA KUMAR

Abbreviations

A.I.C.C.	All India Congress Committee
A.I.U.	All India Unity
B.C.R.	Burma China Road.
B.P.K.C.	Bengal Provincial Khilafat Committee
C.D.A.	Civil Disobedience Arrangements
C.D.M.	Civil Disobedience Movement
C.S.P.	Congress Swarjya Party
C.W.C.	Congress Working Committee
D.P.C.C.	Delhi Provincial Congress Committee
D.S.I.N.C.	Delhi Session of the Indian National Congress
E.C.	Elections for Councils
E.M.	Education Minister
G.M.S.	Gandhi Mission Society
H.M.U.	Hindu-Muslim Unity.
I.L.A.	Indian Legislative Assembly
I.N.C.	Indian National Congress
I.N.T.U.C.	Indian National Trade Union Congress
M.E.	Ministry of Education
M.L.C.	Muslim Leaders' Conference
M.M.A.	Mausoleum of Maulana Azad
M.P.	Majority Party
M.P.	Minority Party
N.K.M.	Non Co-operation and Khilafat Movement
N.L.M.	National Liberation Movement
P.C.C.	Provincial Congress Committees.
P.C.C.U.P.	Provincial Congress Committee of U.P.
P.O.	Public Opinion
P.S.M.E.A.	Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs
S.A.A.	Sabarmati Asharam of Ahmedabad

S.E.S.	Separate Electorate System
S.L.	Swarajyaist Leader
S.P.	Swarajyaist Party
S.S.	Settlement Scheme.
S.S.C.	Special Session of the Congress
T.I.	Technical Institute
U.P.	United Provinces.
W.C.	Working Committee.
W.C.S.	Working Committee's Statement
Y.C.P.	Yeravada Central Prison

List of Documents

S. No.	Subject	Date
1.	Answers on behalf of Maulana Azad to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha about the Primary classes in Delhi Schools.	12-9-1957
2.	About the evening Colleges for Workers	12-9-1957
3.	Regarding S.S.C.S	12-9-1957
4.	Regarding I.B.F. Frankfurt	12-9-1957
5.	Regarding the delegation of Scientiststs	12-9-1957
6.	Regarding the delegation of Indian Scientists to U.S.S.R.	12-9-1957
7.	Regarding I.A.C.S. Jadavpur	12-9-1957
8.	About the C.C.L.	12-11-1957
9.	About the C.B.E.A.	12-11-1957
10.	About the 'Amruta Santana'	12-11-1957
11.	About B.H.U.	12-11-1957
12.	About Nagarjunakonda Excavation	12-11-1957
13.	About T.D.C.	12-11-1957
14.	Regarding E.L.T.I.	12-11-1957
15.	Regarding the Puri Temple in Orissa	12-11-1957
16.	About Delhi Schools	12-11-1957
17.	Regarding C.S.I.R. G. S.	9-12-1957
18.	Regarding the World Youth Organisation	9-12-1957
19.	Regarding E.R.T.S.A.	9-12-1957
20.	Regarding L.G.A.U.	9-12-1957
21.	In connection with the Andaman Education Board	9-12-1957

S. No.	Subject	Date
22.	In connection with the T.M.H.S. Manipur	9-12-1957
23.	In connection with the S.S.C.T.S.	9-12-1957
24.	Regarding the Andhra University Teachers	9-12-1957
25.	In connection with the Ellora Caves	9-12-1957
26.	In connection with S.T.S.	9-12-1957
27.	In connection with P.O.R.	9-12-1957
28.	Regarding the Post-Matric Merit Scholarships to Andaman Students	9-12-1957
29.	Regarding the Pan-Indian Ocean Scientists Conference	9-12-1957
30.	About H.H.B.S.	9-12-1957
31.	About the Janta Colleges	9-12-1957
32.	About J.V.T	9-12-1957
33.	About W.G.T.S.	9-12-1957
34.	About A.C.A.U.	9-12-1957
35.	About the 'Homes' in Madras	9-12-1957
36.	About the employment of Dumb Adults	9-12-1957
37.	Regarding F.A.L.L., Madras	9-12-1957
38.	Statement in the Lok Sabha regarding the proposed strike by Delhi teachers	10-2-1958
39.	Answers, on behalf of Maulana Azad to the questions asked in the Lok Sabha about W.H.T.I., Bombay	13-2-1958
40.	About S.D.C	13-2-1958
41.	About the education for deaf and dumb	13-2-1958
42.	Regarding the higher education for the deaf	17-2-1958

S. No.	Subject	Date
43.	Regarding S.P.W.L.P.	17-2-1958
44.	In connection with the Rajkumari Sports Coaching Scheme	17-2-1958
45.	About the recommendations of D.C., B.R.U.E.	17-2-1958
46.	In Rajya Sabha about the scholarships for the deaf and dumb	17-2-1958
PART II—DEATH OF MAULANA AZAD		
47.	Homage paid by Jawaharlal Nehru and others in the Lok Saba	24-2-1958
48.	Tributes to Maulana Azad in the Rajya Sabha	24-2-1958
PART III—REMAINING DOCUMENTS		
49.	About a memorial from Maulana Azad	16-10-1913
50.	Address at A.I.C.C. Session of Bombay	7-8-1942
51.	Statement regarding the Islamic Law	4-7-1945
52.	On the Communal questions	14-7-1945
53.	Azad, Wavell Plan and the Congress—A Report	18-7-1945
54.	Appeal for the Memorial on Tagore	24-7-1945
55.	To the Congressmen	27-7-1945
56.	Message to Generalissimo	16-8-1945
57.	Interview to the Press	17-8-1945
58.	For permanent political solution	20-8-1945
59.	Homage to Netaji	25-8-1945
60.	On I.N.A. Prisoners	31-8-1945
61.	On Communalism	5-9-1945
62.	Statement to the Press	6-9-1945
63.	Statement to the Press	9-9-1945

S. No.	Subject	Date
64.	Reply to the address of Welcome	26-9-1945
65.	Extracts of Lahore Speech	7-10-1945
66.	Speech at Lahore	7-10-1945
67.	At a Press Conference at Lahore	8-10-1945
68.	On disenfranchisement of soldiers	18-10-1945
69.	Statement to the Press	20-10-1945
70.	Clarification about Sardar Patel	1-12-1945
71.	About the attack on C.P.I. Office	31-1-1946
72.	To the Congress Ministries	7-2-1946
73.	Interview to the Patrika	12-2-1946
74.	Statement to the Press	14-2-1946
75.	Remark on Calcutta incident	15-2-1946
76.	Statement to the Press	20-2-1946
77.	Statement to the Press	22-2-1946
78.	On British Imperialism	24-2-1946
79.	On R.N.I. Strike	28-2-1946
80.	Advice to the Congress Legislators	1-3-1946
81.	Statement to the A.P.I.	4-3-1946
82.	Extracts from a Public address in Bombay	16-3-1946
83.	Interview to the A.P.I.	18-3-1946
84.	Press interview about the meet with Governor of N.W.F.P.	6-4-1946
85.	On League urge for partition	15-4-1946
86.	Interview to the A.P.I.	16-4-1946
87.	On Indian freedom	16-4-1946
88.	On Congress President's election	26-4-1946
89.	On the Cabinat Mission	26-4-1946
90.	On W.C.R.	7-7-1946
91.	On Nehru's speech	7-7-1946

S. No.	Subject	Date
92.	On Delhi Resolution	7-7-1946
93.	Message to W.S.C.	11-7-1946
94.	Statement to the U.P.I.	22-8-1946
95.	To the Press	27-2-1947
96.	Extracts from the Inaugural address at the session of the Standing Committee of the Legislature on Education, held in Shimla	22-5-1947
97.	Azad and the A.I.C.C.	5/6-5-1947
98.	Azad and the A.I.C.C.	13/15-5-1951
99.	Azad and the C.W.C	25/27-1-1951
100.	Azad and the C.W.C.	29-1-1951
101.	Azad and the C.W.C.	31-1-1951
102.	Azad and the C.W.C.	25/26-2-1951
103.	Azad and the C.W.C.	7/8-04-1951
104.	Azad and the C.W.C.	2/3-2-1952
105.	Azad and the C.W.C.	7/8-3-1952
106.	Azad and the C.W.C.	21/24-3-1952
107.	Azad and the C.W.C.	31-5-1952
108.	Azad and the C.W.C.	28/29-6-1952
109.	Azad and the C.W.C.	10-8-1952
110.	Azad and the C.W.C.	12/13-9-1952
111.	Azad and the C.W.C.	9-11-1952
112.	Azad and the C.W.C.	8/13-2-1956
113.	Azad and the C.W.C.	15-4-1946
114.	Azad and the C.W.C.	1/2-6-1956
115.	Azad and the C.W.C.	5-8-1956
116.	Azad and the C.W.C.	25-10-1956
117.	Azad and the C.W.C.	23-3-1957
118.	Azad and the C.W.C.	25-5-1957
119.	Azad and the C.W.C.	29/30-8-1957

S. No.	Subject	Date
120.	Azad and the C.W.C.	16-11-1957
121.	Tribute to Azad by the A.I.C.C.	10/12-5-1958
PART IV		
122.	The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Bill, presented in the Rajya Sabha on behalf of Maulana Azad	11-2-1958
123.	Further Consideration of the Bill	17-2-1958
APPENDICES		
124.	Azad and the Conference of the P.C.C.S. and the leaders of Congress Legislative Parties	2-9-1955
125.	Replies of Dr. Shrimali, on behalf of Maulana Azad, to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha about E.T.E.B.C	11-2-1958
126.	About H.S.C.D.H.P.	11-2-1958
127.	About J.P.S.A.	11-2-1958
128.	About S.E.F.V.	11-2-1958
129.	About O.V.P.T.P.P.	11-2-1958
130.	Regarding R.Q.P.H.S.S., Delhi	11-2-1958
131.	Regarding C.O.U.E.	11-2-1958
132.	Questions and answers in the Lok Sabha in connection with the Mausoleum of Azad	29-4-1958

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	v
<i>Introduction</i>	vii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	ix
<i>List of documents</i>	xi
Documents	1
Appendices	300
Index	320

Document No. 1

**Answers dated 12.9.1957, on behalf of Maulana Azad,
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

PRIMARY CLASSES IN DELHI SCHOOLS

Shri D.C. Sharma: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that in a number of recognised schools in Delhi and New Delhi the Primary class students are provided with tented accommodation;

(b) if so, their number; and

(c) the steps Government propose to take to remove such a disparity in certain schools where only primary class children are accommodated in tents?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹ : (a) Yes, Sir.

I resume the reference is to privately managed and recognised schools.

(b) 55.

(c) There is no such disparity in primary and middle schools. Wherever tented accommodation has been provided, students both of primary and middle Departments are seated in tents.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Sharma.

The hon. Member is hidden by Shri G.P. Sinha who stood in front of him.

Hon. Members do not appreciate my difficulty. There are five hundred Members here and I am not able to fix up who is in which place, because there is a constant change of Members from place to place. Therefore, I would request all hon. Members to put their questions when I call them. They should stand up and call their numbers loudly in which case they will certainly catch my eye. Otherwise I have to spend the time looking again and again and spend a minute or so. Somehow, while putting questions they suddenly reduce their voice.

Shri D.C. Sharma: May I know how long it will take the Government to have buildings for these schools? Has any programme been drawn up?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: During this year Government propose to put up 22 school buildings, but that will not solve the problem. I expect it will take some years before we can provide proper buildings for all the institutions which are at present working in tents.

Shri D.C. Sharma : What is the number of students that are being taught in this tented accommodation?

Dr. K.L. Sharimali: I do not know the exact number, but I believe several thousands.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: In view of the fact that such a shocking state of affairs exists and this is the only big city which has this type of tent schools, do Government propose to take any steps? Are government aware that many of the schools have school funds, but because of certain difficulties in procurement of material, etc., they are unable to put up building? Will Government see that these are given first priority in the building schemes of Delhi?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The Question Hour is over.

Sardar A.S. Saigal: May I request you, Sir, kindly to allow supplementaries on question No. 1730 which has already been answered by the Deputy Minister himself?

Mr. Speaker: No.

Document No. 2

**Replies (on behalf of Maulana Azad) to the questions
asked in the Rajya Sabha on 12-9-1957**

EVENING COLLEGES FOR WORKERS

Shri Abdul Salam: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Punjab University (Camp) College Enquiry Committee has recommended for the establishment of four evening colleges to provide higher educational facilities for the working people; and

(b) if so, the action proposed to be taken thereon?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The matter is being considered in consultation with the parties concerned.

Document No. 3

**Answers dated 12-9-1957, on behalf of Maulana Azad,
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

SCHOLARSHIPS TO SCHEDULED CASTE STUDENTS

Shri Balkrishne Wasnik: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to lay a statement on the Table showing:

(a) the number of Scheduled Caste students, who were not given scholarships in past five years (year-wise);

(b) the reasons therefor; and

(c) whether there has been any lapse of amount sanctioned for the award of scholarships to the Scheduled Caste students during the period mentioned above?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha.

	<i>Statement</i>	
(a) 1952-53	461
1953-54	606
1954-55	1,220
1955-56	2,175
1956-57	3,434

(b) The reasons were mainly as under:

(i) Failure in the last annual examination.

(ii) Failure to join a recognised institution for an approved course of study.

(iii) Ineligible on account of means test.

(iv) Failure to complete their applications in spite of reminders

(c) No.

Document No. 4

**Answers dated 12-9-57, on behalf of Maulana Azad,
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

INTERNATIONAL BOOK FAIR, FRANKFURT

Shri R. Narayanaswamy: Will the Minister of **Education and Scientific Research** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have arranged to send their selected publications and their representatives to the International Book Fair, Frankfurt, Germany;

(b) whether they have requested the Indian Publishers and Booksellers also to send their selected published books to the fair; and

(c) if so, the number of books and the representatives to be sent?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) No, Sir.

(b) and (c) Do not arise.

Document No. 5

**Answers dated 12-9-57, on behalf of Maulana Azad,
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

DELEGATIONS OF SCIENTISTS

Shri Subodh Hasda: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) the procedure adopted by Government in particular for the selection of Members of Delegation of Scientists to International Science Organisation and in general to foreign countries;

(b) whether any roster or panel of names of top-ranking scientists in this country is maintained by Government from which the selections are made;

(c) if so, whether copies of such a roster or panel of names will be made available to the Members of Parliament; and

(d) whether members of such delegation are selected from the Central Government and State Government Scientific Institutions or from the Universities and non-official Institutions also?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) to (d) A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha [See Appendix V, Annexure No. 57.]

Document No. 6

**Answers dated 12-9-57, on behalf of Maulana Azad,
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

DELEGATION OF INDIAN SCIENTISTS TO U.S.S.R.

Shri Subodh Hasda: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to refer to the reply given to Short Notice Question No. 13 on the 31st May, 1957 and state:

(a) whether the delegation of Indian Scientists has left for Russia; and

(b) if not, the reasons for not sending the Delegation?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) and (b) A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [See Appendix V, Annexure No. 60.]

Document No. 7

**Answers dated 12-9-57, on behalf of Maulana Azad,
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

INDIAN ASSOCIATION FOR CULTIVATION OF SCIENCE, JADAVPUR

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) whether any representation has been received on behalf of the employees of the Indian Association for Cultivation of Science, Jadavpur, regarding payment of house rent allowance and city allowance to them; and

(b) if so, the decision of Government thereon?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) and (b) A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [See Appendix V, Annexure No. 64.]

Document No. 8

**Answers dated 12-11-1957, on behalf of Maulana Azad,
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE FOR LIBRARIES

Sardar Iqbal Singh: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 326 on the 24th May, 1957 and state:

(a) the names of the members of the Consultative Committee for Libraries appointed by Government;

(b) whether the Committee has considered the question of development of libraries; and

(c) if so, the main recommendations and suggestions thereof?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) A list of the members of the Consultative Committee for Libraries is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [See Appendix II, Annexure No. 48.]

(b) and (c) The Committee has not completed its work yet.

Document No. 9

**Answers dated 12-11-1957, on behalf of Maulana Azad,
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

COUNCIL FOR BASIC AND ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

Sardar Iqbal Singh: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the proposed Council for Basic and Elementary Education has since been constituted;
- (b) if so, its functions or terms of reference; and
- (c) the names of the members thereof?

Dr. K.L. Shrimall¹: (a) to (c) A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [See Appendix II, Annexure No. 47.]

1. Minister of State for Education.

Document No. 10

**Answers dated 12-11-1957, on behalf of Maulana Azad,
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

'AMRUTRA SANTANA'

Shri Sanganna: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 852 on the 13th August, 1957 and state:

(a) whether any efforts have been made to find out translators for translating *Amruta Santana*, an Oriya novel, into Bengali and Telegu, as these languages are spoken by the Adivasis of certain areas of the State; and

(b) if so, with what results?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: (a) and (b) In the case of Bengali, one translator had offered to translate 'Amruta Santana' in an abridged form but the original author did not give permission for such a translation. As regards Telegu, the Sahitya Akademi has already undertaken translation of another Oriya novel named 'Matir Manish'.

Due to a heavy programme of translations in Bengali and Telegu, it has not been possible for the Akademi, for the present, to take up the translations of 'Amruta Santana' in these two languages.

Document No. 11

**Answers dated 12-11-1957, on behalf of Maulana Azad,
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY

Shri Awasthi: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 1470 on the 4th September, 1957 and state:

(a) whether the Committee appointed by the Visitor of the Banaras Hindu University to enquire into the affairs of the University, has submitted its report;

(b) if so, whether a copy of the Report will be laid on the Table;

(c) if the reply to part (a) above be in the negative, when the Committee is expected to submit its report; and

(d) the reasons for the delay?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) and (d) No definite date can be indicated for the submission of the report by the Committee, as the enquiry is still in progress.

Document No. 12

Answers dated 12-11-57, on behalf of Maulana Azad, to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha

NAGARJUNAKONDA EXCAVATIONS

Shri M.V. Krishna Rao: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 37 on the 21st March 1957 and state:

(a) the results achieved so far in the excavation work undertaken at Nagajunakonda in Andhra Pradesh;

(b) whether Government have any proposal to construct archaeological museum at Nagarjuna Sagar; and

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [See Appendix II, Annexure No. 38.]

(b) It has been decided to construct a museum on the hill-top at Nagarjunakonda, not at Nagarjunasagar.

Document No. 13

**Answers dated 12-11-1957, on behalf of Maulana Azad,
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

THREE-YEAR DEGREE COURSE

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:
Shri D.C. Sharma:
Shri Jhulan Sinha:
Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:
Shri Kodiyan:

Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) which of the universities have not yet accepted or implemented the scheme of the three-year degree course; and

(b) what are the difficulties of these universities?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹ : (a) and (b) A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [See Appendix II, Annexure No. 36.]

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: It is found from the statement that the reasons for which it is not possible for Bombay University to accept this scheme are of a universal and general nature. May I know if these very objections have not been raised by other Universities?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: No, most of the other Universities have accepted the scheme in principle.

Shri D.C. Sharma: May I know if the Ministry of Education is going to give some grants to the University Grants Commission to give to Universities which are going to adopt the three-year degree course?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The Ministry of Education has a scheme for giving grants to the Universities and affiliated colleges for this purpose, but it has still to be finalised.

Shri Bishwanath Roy: May I know whether any State Government has expressed its inability to implement the scheme of three-year degree course?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Is the hon. member referring to any particular State?

Shri Bishwanath Roy: Uttar Pradesh, for example.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: With regard to Uttar Pradesh, I have said that Agra University is the only University which is experiencing special difficulty. Other Universities such as the Allahabad and Lucknow Universities have already accepted the scheme in principle. I have had a discussion with the Education Minister of U.P. recently and he said he was examining the whole thing to see that the scheme could be implemented in all Universities.

Shri Thirumala Rao: Has the attention of Government been drawn to a recent Press note or some news-item to the effect that the Uttar Pradesh Government is opposed to the scheme because it costs Rs. 12 crores?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: That is not correct because I have had a discussion with the Education Minister there, and they are examining the whole scheme.

Shri Hem Barua: In view of the fact that the implementation of the three-year degree course depends mostly on remodelling of secondary education, may I know what steps Government have so far taken by way of providing financial aid towards secondary schools?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The hon. Member is aware that Government are giving grants to State Governments to improve secondary schools also. Reorganisation of secondary education and University education is inter-related, and we have been making efforts to improve both simultaneously.

Document No. 14

**Answers dated 12-11-1957, on behalf of Maulana Azad,
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING INSTITUTE

Dr. Ram Subhag Ssingh:
Shri Kumaran:
Shri Wodeyar:

Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to set up an autonomous institute to improve the teaching of English in the country;

(b) if so, whether the plan for the same has been prepared;

(c) where and when that institute is likely to be set up; and

(d) whether it is a fact that the Ford Foundation of America has made a grant for the establishment of such an institute?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) Yes, Sir.

(c) The Institute is likely to be set up at Hyderabad in the near future.

(d) No, Sir, the grant has not yet been received.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know whether the plan for setting up that institute in Hyderabad has been finally decided and the date has also been fixed for setting up the institute?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: As I said, the institute is likely to be set up at Hyderabad and the Osmania University has already offered a part of its buildings for the location of this Institute. Final decision has still to be taken. As far as I can see, most probably, it will be in Hyderabad that the Institute will be set up. What is the other question?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: By what time?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: We are now awaiting the final sanction from the

Finance Ministry for the whole scheme. As soon as that is received, the work will be started.

Shri Rameshwar Tantia: May I know how much Government propose to spend over this institute?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The total estimate will be Rs. 41 lakhs for the first five years. This does not, of course, include the cost of separate buildings which will cost approximately another Rs. 10 lakhs.

Document No. 15

Answers dated 12-11-1957 by Dr. Shrimali¹ on behalf of Maulana Azad to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha regarding Puri Temple in Orissa

Shri Rameshwar Tanti: Are Government aware of the undersirable carvings in the Puri Temple in Orissa, and if so, whether action is being taken to remove the same?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Puri is not a protected monument.

Shri Balarama Krishnaiah: May I know whether Government have finalised a similar list of monuments in the State of Andhra Pradesh, and if so, what steps have been taken to preserve the monuments there, especially those at Nagarjunakonda?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The hon. Member has now gone to Nagarjunakonda. I shall request him to give notice.

Mr. Speaker: When we are dealing with a particular matter pertaining to a particular State, I cannot allow enlargement of the question to cover all the States.

Shri Panigrahi: My question is unanswered.

Mr. Speaker: It will always be unanswered. The hon. Member was asking whether there was a proposal to increase the contribution to the Archaeological Department in Orissa State. I do not know what answer he expects.

Document No. 16

Answers dated 12-11-1957, on behalf of Maulana Azad, to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha about Delhi Schools

Shri Easwara Iyer:
Shri Naval Prabhakar:
Shri Narayanankutty Menon:

Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Committee set up to enquire into the affairs of non-Government aided schools in Delhi has submitted its report;

(b) if so, the recommendations thereof; and

(c) the extent to which they have been implemented?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) No, Sir,

(b) and (c) Do not arise.

Shri Easwara Iyer: Is the Government in receipt of a number of complaints that the salaries of teachers have not been disbursed by these aided schools for the last six months?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Whenever complaints are received, we have taken action. Some time back, a complaint came to me. I saw that all those teachers who had not received salaries are given in time. I think, as far as my knowledge goes, all the teachers were given salaries. This is a limited question with regard to this Committee. I have already said that we are awaiting the report of this Committee. Necessary action will be taken after the report has been received.

Shri C.K. Nair: There was a Committee called the Implementation Committee appointed a few months ago to deal with the growing educational problems of Delhi and we are told that that Committee has been dropped. Why is it so when the question is still alive?

Mr. Speaker: This committee refers to aided schools only. I do not

1. Minister of State for Education.

know what the committee is which the hon. Member refers to. I am asking Shri C.K. Nair.

Shri C.K. Nair: Can't we put a question.....

Mr. Speaker: Relating to some other committee. If it relates to aided schools, he is entitled to put some more questions regarding them.

Shri C.K. Nair: Almost allied question. We are facing serious problems about education in Delhi. An Implementation Committee was appointed. We are told that it has been dropped.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow this. Hon. Member, if he is so interested, can distrub himself and take the trouble of putting a separate question.

Shri Radha Raman May I know if the Government has put any limit of time for this Committee to submit its report? It is already quite long since this committee was appointed. We are anxiously awaiting its report.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I have requested the Chairman, who is an hon. Member of this House to expedite submission of this report. I understand that the report is in the final stages and will be ready by the end of this month.

Document No. 17

**Answers on behalf of Maulana Azad, to the questions asked
in the Rajya Sabha, on 9-12-1957**

COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH GRANTS TO SCIENTISTS

[**Shri S.C. Samanta:**
Shri R.C. Majhi:

Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to lay a statement on the Table showing:

(a) the subjects for which research grants were sanctioned to individual scientists by the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research during the financial year 1956-57;

(b) the amounts of such grants and the period for which they were sanctioned; and

(c) the results, if any, of the research done under the Scheme?

The Deputy Minister of Education and Scientific Research (Shri M.M. Das): (a) and (b) A statement giving required information is laid on the Table of the House. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-429/57].

(c) The researches are still in progress.

Shri S.C. Samanta: May I know what is the usual procedure for granting this assistance to individual scientists?

Shri M.M. Das : Applications are received by the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research. Then, these applications are referred to the respective Research Committees. There are about 25 or 26 different Research Committees which go through these applications and make their recommendations upon these applications to the governing body of the C.S.I.R. The governing body decide whether the grants should be given and if so, what will be the amount, etc.

Shri S.C. Samanta: May I know whether private institutions and universities, etc. are also given grants over and above these individual scientists?

Shri M.M. Das : Yes, Sir. Universities and private institutions are also given grants for carrying out research.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: Out of the individual scientists who have been given grants, how many are carrying on research in some institution or on an individual basis?

Shri M.M. Das: Without an institution, laboratories, etc. research in modern science cannot be carried out. In the statement that has been submitted, there are altogether 278 items. It is difficult for me just at the present moment to find out how many are working and in what institutions.

Shri Subodh Hasda: May I know the total amount of the grants given during the last three years including the current year and also may I know the maximum amount of financial assistance to a single scientist?

Shri M.M. Das: I have not got the figures of last three years with me. I have got figures of the total amount of grants given last year, namely 1956-57, to individual scientists. The total amount comes to Rs. 25,60,000 and odd. This year, we have got a budget provision for this purpose, of Rs. 23 lakhs. The maximum amount that has been given to an individual scientist will be — I am not prepared to commit myself on this point — about Rs. 60,000 or round about that figure.

Shri S.C. Samanta: May I know whether a single scientist is entitled to financial assistance if he carries on research in more than one subject?

Shri M.M. Das : Yes, Sir, He is entitled, and we have given.

Pandit J.P. Jyotishi: May I know if these persons who are given grants are required to submit six-monthly or yearly reports on the work they have done?

Shri M.M. Das: Yes, Reports are called for and the report for 1956-57 is being compiled now.

Document No. 18

**Replies on behalf of Maulana Azad, to the questions
dated 9-12-1957, asked in the Rajya Sabha**

WORLD YOUTH ORGANISATION

Shri Raghunath Singh: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state whether it is a fact that a convention of World Youth Organisation is going to be held in India in August, 1958?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: The Government of India has no such proposal; but it is understood from the India Committee of the World Assembly of Youth, that they propose to hold the next Session of the General Assembly of Youth, in India in August, 1958.

Shri Hem Barua: May I know if the invitations to the countries that will attend this World Youth conference would conform to the composition of the U.N. membership or be according to the tenets of our foreign policy?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: There is no question. This is a world assembly of youth and functions through national committees, and naturally the representatives of the organisations which are members of this organisation will participate in the conference.

Shri Panigrahi: The hon. Minister said that the particular youth organisation called the World Assembly of Youths is sponsoring this convention. May I know whether the countries like the Soviet Union and other Democracies are being invited to this convention?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That would not be for the Government to say whether they would invite or not; it would be for the organisation.

Shri Panigrah: They have got a list, therefore I wanted to know.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Whether they would invite all of them or not would be for the organisation, not for the Government, to say.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: May I know whether this World Assembly

has any affiliated national unit in India, and if so, what is their membership?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: There are three organisations which are connected with this organisation: the AICC Youth Department, the Congress Seva Dal and the Akhil Hindu Yuvak Sangh.

Shri Ansar Harvani: Is the Government aware that the youth organisations in the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China are not affiliated to this Assembly?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Hon. Members are asking questions which have absolutely no relevance to this question.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They are giving information.

Shri Punnoose: May I know the total membership of those organisations which are affiliated to this world organisation from India, and may I also know whether there are other youth organisations which are not affiliated to this?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I have already answered that question. I have already said there are three organisations which are affiliated to this organisation.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is whether their strength is known or not.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I cannot give their number or strength.

Shri Panigrahi: I would like to know the nature of help that the Government of India is proposing to extend to this Convention.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The organisation wrote to the Government to give some assistance, but the organisation has not yet indicated the special kind of assistance it would need, and I am told most of the expenditure would be met by the organisation itself.

Shri Heda rose —

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Would he like himself to be included in youth?

Shri Heda: At least I am connected with some organisations.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right.

Shri Heda: May I know whether the Government of India think it advisable that from the Indian point of view they should accept some organisations in India as representatives of Indian youth, and if so, whether they have accepted some organisations, and in that case, may I know the names of those organisations?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Government has no organisations of its own. Government wants to encourage all organisations which work on democratic lines.

Document No. 19

Replies on behalf of Maulana Azad, to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha on 9-12-1957

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION IN TRIBAL AND SCHEDULED AREAS

Shri Sanganna: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) the special steps that have been taken by the Union Government to fulfil the directive given in Article 45 of the Constitution within the next ten to fifteen years in the field of elementary education in the Tribal and Scheduled areas in the different States;

(b) whether any educational survey has been undertaken to find out the causes of the slow rate of progress in these areas; and

(c) if so, with what results?

Dr. K.L. Shrimall¹: (a) The Government of India have been giving grants for the welfare schemes of the tribals which include educational facilities in the form of stipends, scholarships, supply of stationery, exemption from tuition fees, erection of school buildings, establishment of Ashram Schools etc.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) Does not arise.

Shri Sanganna: In view of the fact that the present system of education introduced in the tribal areas is not suitable to the uplift of the adivasis, may I know what steps are going to be taken by the Government to change the present system of education in tribal areas?

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: Some of the institutions which are being started are considered to be very suitable for the tribal areas, these ashram schools, for example. I do not agree with the hon. Member's suggestion.

Shri Sanganna: What is the percentage of literacy among the people in the scheduled areas and tribal areas of the country?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I do not have the figures; but it must be very low.

Shri Ranga: May I know what has been the experience of the Government in having a sufficient number of suitable teachers for these special schools in the hills and other places where the tribal people are living? Is there any special effort being made to train the tribal people themselves as teachers?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I should like to have notice of that question. But I may say that educated people among the tribals are eligible for appointment as teachers also.

Shri Ranga: It is not enough.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Are Government satisfied that elementary education is being imparted in the mother tongue?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: In most of the states, the policy of the Government is that education at the elementary stage should be imparted through the mother tongue. If the hon. Member wants to know about any specific State, I shall have to ask for notice.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I want the information in respect of all the scheduled areas.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will put an unstarred question.

Document No. 20

Answers on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 9-12-1957, to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha

LOANS AND GRANTS TO ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY

Shri Ranakasabai: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Annamalai University has applied for a loan and a grant for building hostels for students; and

(b) if so, the amount sanctioned so far by Government?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) No decision has been taken on these requests so far.

Document No. 21

**Answers on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 9-12-1957,
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

ANDAMAN EDUCATION BOARD

Sardar A.S. Saigal: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that it has been finally decided to affiliate the Andaman Educational Board to the Central Board of Education, Ajmer; and

(b) if so, from what date?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) Yes Sir.

(b) From 1960.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: In answer to an earlier question, the hon. Minister stated that the policy is that education should be imparted in the mother tongue. In view of that, may I know whether there has been any representation from the people in the Andamans that education should be imparted there in the various schools in the mother tongue of the population there? May I also know whether there is any proposal to affiliate the Educational Board to universities other than Ajmer?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The proposal is that the schools should be affiliated to the Ajmer Board from 1960. As regards the question of medium of instruction, as I said, it is the policy of the Government to impart education at the elementary stage through the mother tongue. I think Hindi and Urdu are the languages of most of the people.

Shri Tangaman: Is it not true that more than 50 per cent. of the people residing in Andamans are Tamil-speaking people?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: People from all parts of India have gone to Andaman and Nicobar islands. So, it is very difficult to say from which part the majority of the people have come. I cannot give the exact figures.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: They are Bengalis and Tamilians.

Mr. Speaker: This information can be obtained from the census figures.

1. Minister of State for Education.

Document No. 22

Replies, on behalf of Maulana Azad, to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha on 9-12-1957

TEACHERS IN MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOLS IN MANIPUR

Shri L. Achaw Singh: Will the Minister of Education and scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there is a great shortage of teachers in Government Middle and High Schools in the tribal areas of Manipur;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor; and

(c) whether Government propose to grant the teacher in Manipur special hill allowance as is the case in certain hill districts of Assam?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) The matter is under consideration.

Shri L. Achaw Singh: Is the Government aware of the fact that teachers would not like to go to the hills without any extra allowance and there are complaints from some parts of the hills that there has been inadequate staff in the middle and high schools?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I have not quite followed the question. If the hon. Member is referring to the question of hill allowance, I would like to inform him that the matter is under consideration of the Government.

Shri Ranga: Am I to take it that this matter is under consideration, not only in regard to those particular tribal areas, but for tribal areas as a whole?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: At present the matter is under consideration in regard to Manipur. The other larger question will also be examined.

Shri B.K. Gaikwad: How long will it take for the Government to decide this matter?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Shortly.

Mr. Speaker: Both sections of the House must be satisfied with the question and answer: "How long will it take to decide the matter" "Shortly" !

1. Minister of State for Education.

Document No. 23

**Answers, on behalf of Maulana Azad, to the questions
asked in the Rajya Sabha on 9-12-1957**

SCHOLARSHIP TO SCHEDULED CASTES AND SCHEDULED TRIBES STUDENTS

Dr. Sushila Nayar: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) the amount of money spent on scholarships and on assistance given for buying books to boys and girls of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes during the financial year 1956-57, separately;

(b) whether scholarships are disbursed at the beginning of the academic year or at the end;

(c) whether Government have received reports that several students are forced to leave their studies because of the late receipt of scholarship money; and

(d) if so, the number of students, if any, so affected and the measures proposed to be taken to rectify the situation?

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha.

Statement

(a) The amount of scholarship in each case, includes a reasonable amount for the purchase of books. The expenditure incurred on the scholarships to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes scholars, during the financial year 1956-57, was as under:

Scheduled Castes. . . .Rs. 87,98,891/-

Scheduled Tribes. . . .Rs. 15,77,850/-

Total : Rs. 103,76,741/-

(b) *Ad hoc* grants sent to the institutions, are paid for a period of four months to the eligible Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes candidates, at the commencement of the academic session. The rest of the scholarships money is paid during the course of the academic session.

(c) No.

(d) Does not arise.

Document No. 24

**Replies, on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 9-12-1957
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

ANDHRA UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

Shri Nagi Reddy:
Shri Ramam:

Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have granted any money so far to increase the scales of pay of the Andhra University teachers as per the recommendations of the University Grants Commission;

(b) whether the recommendation has been implemented by the Andhra University in the years 1956-57 and 1957-58 (so far); and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) University Grants Commission is itself competent to sanction grants to Universities and has paid grants to Andhra University for improvement of scales of pay of its teachers.

(b) The University has accepted the recommendations of the Commission regarding revision of the salary scales of University teachers under the Second Five Year Plan and action is being taken by the University to pay the salaries in accordance with the recommendations for the year 1956-57. The grant for the year 1957-58 for this purpose will be paid to the University before the close of the current financial year.

(c) Does not arise.

Document No. 25

**Answers, on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 9-12-1957
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

ELLORA CAVES

Shri Pangarkar: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) the amount spent on the maintenance of the Ellora caves during 1956-57; and

(b) the amount proposed to be spent during 1957-58?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) Rs. 41,297.

(b) Rs. 35,000.

Document No. 26

**Answers, on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 9-12-1957
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

SCHOLARSHIPS TO TRIBAL STUDENTS

Shri Hynniewta: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) the total amount of money given as scholarships to the tribal students of the tribal areas of Assam since the attainment of Independence year-wise;

(b) the number of such tribal students receiving technical scholarships and the amount spent on them during the above period; and

(c) whether Government propose to extend scholarships to Primary and Secondary stage of education?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) and (b) Area-wise statistics of the scholarships awarded are not maintained and therefore the requisite information cannot be supplied.

(c) No, Sir.

Document No. 27

**Replies, on behalf of Maulana Azad, to the questions
dated 9-12-57 asked in the Rajya Sabha**

PRODUCTION UNITS FOR THE RESCUED

Shri R.S. Lal: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state the details of the production units to be established by Central Social Welfare Board for (i) rescued women; (ii) boys and girls discharged from correctional institutions; (iii) for disabled and blind men and women.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: A statement giving the requisite information is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha [See Appendix V, Annexure No. 63.]

1. Minister of State for Education.

Document No. 28

**Replies, on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 9-12-1957
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

POST-MATRIC MERIT SCHOLARSHIPS TO ANDAMAN STUDENTS

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) the number of students of the Andaman Islands who were awarded scholarships in 1956-57 under the Central Post-Matric Merit Scholarships Scheme; and

(b) how many students of pre-matric classes received the benefit of the Central Scholarship Scheme during the said period?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) Nil.

(b) Nil.

Document No. 29

**Answers, on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 9-12-1957
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

PAN-INDIAN OCEAN SCIENTISTS CONFERENCE

Shri Subodh Hasda: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government of India have decided to send a delegation of Scientists to the Conference organised by the Pan-Indian Ocean Scientists Association to be held in October, 1957;

(b) if so, the number of Members that have been selected or going to be selected by Government and the names of such members;

(c) the venue of the Conference; and

(d) the amount of expenditure that has to be incurred on the delegation by Government?

Dr. K.L. Shrimall¹ (a) to (d) An invitation to participate in the forthcoming Congress of the Pan-Indian Ocean Science Association to be held at Tananarive in Madagascar during October-November, 1957 is under consideration. The expenditure involved would depend on the size of the delegation that may be sent.

Document No. 30

**Answers, on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 9-12-1957
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

HARIJAN HOSTELS AND BOARDING SCHOOLS

Shri Kumbhar: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) whether Harijan Hostels, Ashrams and Boarding Schools are separately managed by the States and the Union Government uptil now;

(b) whether the non-Harijan students are not taken into the aforesaid institutions;

(c) if so, the State-wise number of such segregated schools etc. and

(d) the reasons therefor?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: (a) and (b) Harijan Hostels, Ashrams and Boarding schools have been started in various States and are run under the management of State Governments or the Voluntary Agencies. The hostels etc., started under the Centrally Sponsored Programme are also managed by the State Governments or the non-official agencies.

In order to avoid segregation, the policy of the Government is not to start hostels exclusively for a particular class or community. In fact, in all the Harijan Hostels, run by the Government or the non-official agencies in receipt of Government assistance, a small number of non-Harijans are also encouraged to take admission.

(c) and (d) Do not arise.

Document No. 31

Replies, on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 9-12-1957 to the questions asked in Rajya Sabha about the Janata Colleges

Shri S.R. Arumugham: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to lay a statement on the Table showing:

(a) the number of Janata Colleges opened so far in various States in the country; and

(b) how many students have been benefited by these institutions?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [See Appendix V, Annexure No. 66.]

(b) The information is not available.

Document No. 32

**Replies, on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 9-12-1957
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

INDIAN VOLLEY-BALL TEAM AT HELSINKI

**[Shri B.S. Murthy:
Shri Bhakt Darshan:**

Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to refer to the reply given to the last supplementary raised on Starred Question No. 1237 on 27th August, 1957 and lay a statement of facts on the Table with regard to the allegation that a lady accompanied the Indian Volleyd Ball team which participated in the International Sports at Helsinki?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: If the Hon. Member is referring to the Olympic Games held at Helsinki in 1952, no Volley-ball team from India went there.

1. Minister of State for Education.

Document No. 33

**Replies, on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 9-12-1957
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

WEST GERMAN TECHNICAL SCHOLARSHIPS

Shri Elayaperumal: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received any applications so far from Madras State for West German Technical scholarships; and

(b) if so, their number?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) 2.

Document No. 34

**Replies, on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 9-12-57 to the
questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE OF ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY

Shri Elayaperumal: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state the amount if any, allotted to the Agricultural College in Annamalai University for the year 1956-57?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education and Scientific Research (Dr. K.L. Shrimali): Nil.

Document No. 35

**Replies, on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 9-12-1957
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

'HOMES' IN MADRAS

Shri Elayaperumal: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the Madras Government in consultation with the State Social Welfare Advisory Board has submitted schemes for starting 'Homes' in that State?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education and Scientific Research (Dr. K.L. Shrimali) : Yes, Sir.

Document No. 36

**Answers, on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 9-12-1957
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

EMPLOYMENT OF DUMB ADULTS

Shri Elayaperumal: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state the number of dumb adults employed so far through the Employment Office, Madras?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education and Scientific Research (Dr. K.L. Shrimali): None.

Document No. 37

**Answers, on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 9-12-1957
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR LIBRARIES AND LABORATORIES IN MADRAS

Shri Elayaperumal: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government of Madras have applied for any financial assistance for the improvement of Libraries, Laboratories and for the raising of salaries of the Higher Secondary grade teachers during the Second Five Year Plan;

(b) if so, the amount allotted for the same; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education and Scientific Research (Dr. K.L. Shrimali): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Rs. 12,05,518 have been sanctioned upto 31st August, 1957.

(c) Does not arise.

Document No. 38

Statement Re: Proposed Strike by Delhi Teachers'

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education and Scientific Research (Dr. K.L. Shrimali): The House will recall that the Delhi State Teachers' Association threatened in July 1957 to go on a 'chalk down' strike for four days with effect from the 20th August, 1957, and in that connection, I made a statement on the 13th August, 1957, on the floor of the House detailing the various demands of the Teachers' Association and the action taken thereon. The demands of the Teachers' Association have been looked into carefully and wherever it was found possible, Government have accepted them. A couple of cases are, however, still under consideration.

I may briefly recall that whereas only 23 teachers were permanent in Government schools on 1.2.1957, about 2,000 teachers have been made permanent by this time, which was one of the main demands of the teachers. My Ministry went to the extent of issuing a directive to the Delhi Administration to recall some of the local bodies' school teachers who had been retired, in order to give them the benefit of superannuation.

A deputation of the Association met me on the 12th December, 1957, and I explained to them the Government's standpoint in the matter. I also advised them not to take recourse to strike which will lower their professional dignity and also harm the interest of young children. They were advised to discuss the matter further with the Ministry and a communication was addressed to them accordingly. I have to say with regret that, instead of contacting the Ministry or acknowledging the communication addressed to them, they passed a resolution to go on strike from the 12th February, 1958.

On the 28th January, 1958, the Education Minister received a deputation of the Teachers' Association. He gave the representatives an assurance that he would do all he could to meet their reasonable grievances. He repeated the suggestion made by me, and advised them to meet a senior officer of the Ministry and discuss their grievances with

him. He also assured them that he would give sympathetic consideration to their demands. He further observed that the Government could not negotiate under the threat of a strike and, in order to proceed further in the matter, it was advisable for the Association to withdraw their strike notice. The representatives of the Association informed the Education Minister that they would place before the General Body their report on the discussions in the interview and apprise the Government of their decision in this behalf.

In their resolution dated 2nd February, 1958, wherein they regret their inability to withdraw the notice of the strike, it is stated that the unexpected and astonishing statements that appeared in the Press presumably from the governmental sources have had a most disappointing and provocative effect on the teacher community. The presumption contained in the above quoted sentence is incorrect. Government have not issued any such Press statement regarding the meeting of the representatives of Delhi Teachers with the Education Minister on the 28th January, 1958, and the Association has been informed accordingly. They have further been informed that the offer made by the Education Minister on the 28th January, 1958, when they met him still stands. The initiative now lies with the Association.

I may further add that my Ministry has been making serious efforts to improve the prospects and conditions of the teaching profession not only in Delhi but all over the country.

Document No. 39

**Answers to questions by Dr. M.M. Das in the Lok Sabha
on behalf of Maulana Azad**

LOK SABHA

Thursday, 13th February, 1958

WESTERN HIGHER TECHNOLOGICAL INSTITUTE, BOMBAY

**[Shri Subodh Hasda:
Shri S.C. Samanta:**

Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) what progress has been made in the establishment of the Western Higher Technological Institute, Bombay;

(b) whether Russian Professors and equipment have arrived; and

(c) whether it will be possible for Government to admit students during the academic year 1958-59?

The Deputy Minister of Education and Scientific Research (Shri M.M. Das): (a) The Memorandum and Articles of Association for the purpose of registering the Institute as a Society have been drafted and the constitution of the first Board of Governors has been completed. The registration will be done soon and the Board will take over the task of administration and development of the Institute.

The site at Powai has been made over by the Government of Bombay and a Master Plan giving the layout of the various buildings has been prepared. Construction work on the workshops for the Institute and some staff quarters has started. It is expected that work on a few other buildings will also start shortly.

It has been arranged with the Silk and Art Silk Research Association that the four storeyed Technology Block in the new building being put up by the Association at Worli will be made available to the Institute for a period of two years to enable it to start the Courses this year. The building will be ready in March 1958.

42 posts of Assistant Professors and Lecturers have been advertised and Selection Committees are at work at present. Six of the selected candidates will be sent to U.S.S.R. this year for training.

(b) 13 Russian Professors have already arrived in the country and equipment costing about Rs. 3 lakhs has also been received. More equipment is expected during the next few months.

(c) The Institute expects to admit the first batch of students this year.

Shri Subodh Hasda: May I know the terms and conditions under which the building of the Silk and Art Silk Research Association would be handed over to us?

Shri M.M. Das: The Silk and Art Silk Research Association did not demand any rent from the Government of India. They said that the only term and condition was that after two years, the building would be given back to them in the same condition in which it has been handed over to us.

Shri Subodh Hasda: What is the number of boys that will be admitted in the next academic year?

Shri M.M. Das: There is already some difficulty in finding properly and adequately qualified teachers. But if the recruitment of staff is according to the schedule and if the staff position is satisfactory, we hope that 100 boys will be admitted in the next academic year.

Pandit D.N. Tiwary: May I know whether it is a fact that at the Technological Institute at Kharagpur, many of the seats are not filled for want of candidates with the requisite qualifications? If so, what is the use of opening another institute at Bombay when the one at Kharagpur is not filled up fully, although the students are taken from all over India?

Shri M.M. Das: We have on more than one occasion told hon. Members here that so far as the recruitment of properly qualified staff in our technological and engineering institutions is concerned, it is highly unsatisfactory and it is a fact that some posts remain vacant in the Kharagpur Institute. But we have to go on and expand our technical education and so we are going to establish this Institute. We think that it will be possible for us to recruit the minimum staff that will be necessary and in this respect, we expect to get some help from the Russian Government. Russian professors are also coming to help us.

Shri S.C. Samanta: May I know the approximate expenditure that is going to be incurred during the Second Five Years Plan and the cost of equipment that will be there in the present year?

Shri M.M. Das: During the Second Five Year Plan, about Rs. 325 lakhs have been earmarked for this institution. During the next year's

budget, there is provision for Rs. 22 lakhs. So far as the equipment position is concerned, perhaps in the statement I have already said that equipment worth about Rs. 3 lakhs has already been received by us and the UNESCO has placed orders for equipment as follows: U.S.S.R. about Rs. 44,52,700; U.K. about Rs. 46,900; U.S.A. about Rs. 24,000 and Germany about Rs. 17,74,400.

Shri B.K. Galkwad: May I know what salaries will be paid to the Russian professors?

Shri M.M. Das : There is an agreement so far as I remember, but I am not prepared to commit myself on this point. The salaries and other things will be borne by the Russian Government, but the expenditure to be incurred here on their accommodation, contingency, assistance etc. will be borne by us.

Document No. 40

**Answers by Dr. M.M. Das¹ to the questions asked in
the Lok Sabha on 13-2-1958**

SCIENTIFIC DOCUMENTATION CENTRE

Shri S.C. Samanta:

Shri Subodh Hasda:

Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to lay a statement on the Table showing:

(a) whether the Scientific Documentation Centre functioning in the National Physical Laboratory is adequately equipped with necessary trained personnel and equipments;

(b) the total expenditure that has been incurred for the establishment of the Centre;

(c) whether any complaint has been received regarding the excessive charges prescribed for the facilities offered by the Centre; and

(d) the amounts realised as fees so far by the Documentation Centre since its establishment?

The Deputy Minister of Education and Scientific Research (Shri M.M. Das): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Council of Scientific and Industrial Research have incurred an expenditure of Rs. 16,77,630.07 upto 31st December 1957. The UNESCO contributed equipment and supplies worth \$ 85,000.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) Rs. 1,16,155.27, upto 31st December, 1957.

Shri S.C. Samanta: What are the functions of the Indian Scientific Documentation Centre?

Shri M.M. Das: There is one function to see that the articles which are published in the scientific journals of other countries are made

available to the scientists of our country. There is another function to translate the scientific articles published in foreign languages into English and distribute them to the scientists who need them. There are some publications also — bibliography and other things — brought out by these organisations.

Shri S.C. Samanta: May I know whether any difficulty has arisen as to the copyright of the scientific articles that have been issued to the scientists?

Shri M.M. Das: I do not think there has been any difficulty, because so far as I remember, there is an international convention or something like that under which some scientific articles or some chapters of scientific books can be duplicated and distributed to scientists for their research work.

Shri Subodh Hasda: May I know whether the Scientific Documentation Centre is part and parcel of the National Physical Laboratory?

Shri M.M. Das: It is not exactly part and parcel of the National Physical Laboratory, but the Director of the National Physical Laboratory is the head of that institution and the money to be spent on the Scientific and Industrial Research. Both the Organisations — National Physical Laboratory and the Scientific Documentation Centre — have got a common library.

Document No. 41

**Answers to questions asked in the Rajya Sabha on 17-2-1958
by Dr. Shrimali, on behalf of Maulana Azad, about the
education for deaf and dumb**

Shri Amolakh Chand: May I know whether the education for deaf and dumb boys is free and compulsory, or whether they have to pay any tuition fees?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: There is no question of making education free and compulsory for deaf children because there are not adequate facilities in the country at present and the Ministry is trying to secure admission in industrial schools for these people.

Dr. Raghubir Singh: May I know whether it is free in those institutions wherever the facilities are there?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: As I said, we have been giving scholarships and wherever possible, they are given free education.

Document No. 42

**Answers on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 17-2-1958,
to the questions asked in the Lok Sabha**

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR THE DEAF

Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 537 in the Rajya Sabha on the 19th December, 1957, and state whether Government have received any representation from the deaf that arrangements should be made for their higher education?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: Yes, Sir. Recently a deputation on behalf of All India Federation of the Deaf made a representation.

Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam: May I know up to what standard the education is given to the students in the present schools for the deaf and dumb?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: As far as my knowledge goes, there are no special schools for deaf and dumb.

Dr. R.B. Gour: There is one in Hyderabad.

Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam: There are so many in every State.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I think the hon. Member was asking for higher educational institutions. There is not a single educational institution at the higher education level.

Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam: I would like to repeat my question. May I know up to what standard education is given to students in these schools at present?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I shall need notice for that.

Shri B.K. Mukerjee: May I know, whether, after higher education, the deaf and dumb persons are eligible for employment under the Government or under private employers?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: It is for the private employers to employ them. The Government have a proposal to secure special employment for the handicapped persons which would include deaf and dumb also.

1. Minister of State for Education.

Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam: May I know if the Government have not been able to make arrangements for the higher education for the deaf and dumb school students on completing their education in the school, what are the other ways and means which the Government adopt to train them to rehabilitate them?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: As far as my knowledge goes, there is only one institution in the whole world which gives higher education to deaf and dumb people and that is in Washington. Even as far as the secondary education is concerned, there is only one institution at the secondary stage in England, and the Government proposes to provide minimum education before they think of setting up higher educational institutions. I have already said that Government have under consideration the setting up of an industrial school for the training of these deaf and dumb persons.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: I only wanted to ask whether it is not a fact that we really cannot do much for deaf and dumb children because of lack of trained personnel. It requires very highly skilled and trained personnel to do anything for them. Has the Government got any scheme for getting personnel trained?

Mr. Chairman: You are giving the answer.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The Government has under consideration, as I said, the starting of an industrial school.

Document No. 43

**Answers, on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 17-2-1958
to the questions asked in the Lok Sabha**

SETTING UP OF PILOT WELFARE EXTENSION PROJECTS IN URBAN AREAS

Shri P.S. Rajagopal Naidu: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

- (a) whether there is any scheme before the Central Social Welfare Board for setting up Pilot Welfare Extension Projects in urban areas;
- (b) if so, how many such Projects will be set up and what assistance will be given from the Board to each Project; and
- (c) what will be the activities of these Projects?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) 100 such Project are expected to be set up and the Board will assist to the extent of Rs. 25,000 for each Project for the remaining period of the Second Plan.

(c) Welfare services for women, children, delinquents, the physically handicapped and recreational and cultural activities for the community.

Shri P.S. Rajagopal Naidu: May I know whether there is any such similar pilot scheme for the rural areas contemplated?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Yes, the hon. Member is probably aware that the Social Welfare Board has several Pilot Projects for the rural areas.

Document No. 44

**Answers, on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 17-2-1958
to the questions asked in the Lok Sabha**

RAJKUMARI SPORTS COACHING SCHEME

Shri Amolakh Chand : Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) Whether Government have decided to transfer the Rajkumari Sports Coaching Scheme from the Ministry of Health to the Ministry of Education and Scientific Research; and

(b) if so, whether it will be administered by the All-India Council of Sports?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali¹: (a) Yes, Sir. The transfer has already been effected.

(b) The question of administrative set-up is under consideration.

Shri Amolakh Chand: May I know whether the Government of India have appointed any committee to look after this scheme?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Yes, there is a committee to look after this scheme.

Shri Amolakh Chand: Who are the members of that committee?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Rajkumariji is the chairman of that committee and if the hon. Member is interested I can give the other names, it is a list of 14 or 16 names. I may place a copy of it on the Table.

Shri Amolakh Chand: May I know whether this scheme has made any progress, and what is the coaching programme for 1958?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Well, the coaching is being done all over the country — coaching the athletes, coaching in tennis, football, volleyball, hockey, swimming; and for 1958-59 there is a provision for Rs. 5 lakhs. That is for expenditure during the year 1958-59.

Shri T.D. Pustake: Do you think any foreign personnel is required for this coaching?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: As far as I know — I speak subject to correction — there are some foreign coaches also.

1. Minister of State for Education.

Document No. 45

Answers, on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 17-2-1958 to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha about the Recommendations of D.C.B.R.U.E.

Amolakh Chand: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state whether Govt. have taken any decisions on the recommendation of the Deshmukh Committee regarding the reorganisation of university education and if so, when they are likely to be implemented?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: No, Sir.

Shri Amolakh Chand: May I know whether any of the recommendations is not under the consideration of the Government and whether they have agreed to the request that the intermediate colleges should reduce their course by one year and increase the degree course to 3 years?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Yes. The whole recommendation of this Committee is about the implementation of the scheme with regard to the three-year degree course and this Committee has suggested practical steps; and the financial aspect is under consideration.

Shri Amolakh Chand: May I know whether the Central Government have decided to give some financial help to the States if they took up this three-year degree course? If so, what is the proportion of their help to the expenditure?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The whole proposition is under consideration.

Shrimati Chandravati Lakhanpal: Besides the starting of this three-year degree course, what are the other features of this scheme of reorganisation of university education?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: If the hon. Member is interested, I may place the Report of this Committee on the Table—in the Library.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I may mention that there is the fixing of a ceiling to the number of college students, a definite student-teacher ratio,

strengthening laboratories and libraries and also improving the quality of the education. I will place the whole Report in the Library.

Shri Prithviraj Kapoor: May I know whether the Government is taking up the question of weaning the students in the universities from the habit of strikes and all that?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: That would be the result of the general improvement in educational standards.

Shri H.N. Kunzru: The hon. Minister said that the financial aspect of the proposals made in the Deshmukh Committee's Report was under the consideration of Government. But did not the Government know the cost of the introduction of the three-year degree scheme when they recommended it to the various universities?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Yes, the Government had some rough idea about the cost that would be incurred in the implementation of these recommendations; but we wanted this Committee to go into all the details and then make their recommendations.

Shri H.N. Kunzru: What is it now under the consideration of the Government, the stages by which money should be provided or the feasibility of the scheme?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: There is discussion going on between the Education Ministry and the Finance Ministry about the feasibility of the scheme and I am hoping that a decision will soon be taken on this matter.

Document No. 46

**Answers, on behalf of Maulana Azad, dated 17-2-1958
to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha**

SCHOLARSHIP FOR THE DEAF AND DUMB

Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 123 in the Rajya Sabha on the 19th December, 1957, and state;

(a) what was the amount of the scholarship sanctioned to each deaf and dumb student; and

(b) what was the total number of applications for scholarships received, the number of applications sanctioned and the number of students who actually accepted the scholarships during the year 1956-57?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: (a) Rs. 75.00 p.m., per student.

(b) By the end of March, 1957 the total number of applications received was 104; out of 104 applicants 78 were awarded scholarships in 1957-58 and out of the latter 46 have so far accepted the scholarships.

Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam: What is the procedure to select candidates who are given scholarships and whether there is any Committee formed for distribution of these?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Yes, there is a selection committee.

Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam: May I know if it is a fact that there are students who were sanctioned these scholarships but they could not accept it as they were refused admission in ordinary colleges like polytechnics and other schools?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: That is so. In fact in almost every case the Ministry has to secure the admission for these people. Ordinarily, because they are deaf and dumb, they are not given admission in ordinary institutions. The Ministry has to make an effort and secure admission for these people.

Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam: What are the reasons when 78 persons were granted the scholarships, only 46 could get it?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I have explained the reason. As soon as a person is admitted, then he gets the scholarship.

Shri Maheswar Naik: May I know whether Government have any enumeration of the number of deaf and dumb students of school-going age?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I think I have that information. It is estimated that there are at least 35,000 deaf children of school-going age in this country.

Shri Maheswar Naik: What are the arrangements to impart education to all these students?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: There are not adequate arrangements in the country at present.

Shrimati T. Nallamuthu Ramamurti: If there are so many students who have not secured admission, and therefore they had to forego the amount of scholarships, is there not a need for the Government to create facilities and to set up institution for this purpose?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Government have a proposal under consideration to set up an institution here.

Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam: May I know the names of members of the Committee which sanctions these scholarships and may I know if there is any deaf adviser on it?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I don't know whether a deaf adviser would really be useful to a committee like this but the following members are on the Committee: Dr. Bhan, Shri V. A. Basurkar, Shri A.C. Sen and others.

PART II: DEATH OF MAULANA AZAD

Document No. 47

**Homage, paid by Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru and others in the
Lok Sabha, dated 24-2-1958**

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Finance (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it has fallen to my lot often to refer in this House to the death of a colleague or some great man. I have to perform that duty, a sad duty, again today in regard to one who was with us a few days ago and who passed away rather suddenly producing a sense of deep sorrow and grief not only to his colleagues in Parliament, but to innumerable people all over the country.

Now, it has become almost, if I may say so, a common place, when a prominent person passes away, to say that he is irreplaceable, that his passing away has created a void which cannot be filled. To some extent that is often true yet, I believe that it is literally and absolutely true in regard to the passing away of Maulana Azad. I do not mean to say that no great men will be born in India; certainly not. We have had great men and we will have great men but, I do submit that that peculiar and special type of greatness that Maulana Azad represented is not likely to be reproduced in India or anywhere else.

I need not refer to his many qualities which we all know – his deep learning, his scholarship and his great oratory. He was a great writer and he was great in many ways. But there are other scholars; there are other writers; there are other orators, but there was this combination in him of the greatness of the past with the greatness of the present. He represented and he always reminded me of what I have read in history about the great men of several hundred years ago, say, if I think of European history, the great men of the Renaissance, or in a later period, of the encyclopaedists who preceded the French Revolution, men of intellect, men of action. He reminds me also of what might be called the great qualities of olden days—the graciousness of them. There were many bad qualities of course, in the old days, but there was a

certain graciousness, a certain courtesy, a certain tolerance, a certain patience which is sadly to seek in the world today. There is little of graciousness in the world, even though we may become more and more advance in scientific and technical ways. Even though we may seek to reach the Moon, we do it with a lack of graciousness, with a lack of tolerance, with a lack of some things which have made life worthwhile since life began. So, it was this strange and unique mixture of the good qualities of the past, the graciousness, the deep learning and toleration with the urges of today that made Maulana Azad what he was.

Everyone knows that even in his early teens he was filled with the passion for freeing India and he turned towards ways even of violent revolution. And, then, he realised, of course, soon after that that was not the way which would gain results.

He was a peculiar and a very special representative in a high degree of that great composite culture which has gradually grown in India. I do not mean to say that everybody has to be like Maulana Azad to represent that composite culture. There are many representatives of it to various parts of India; but he, in his own venue, here in Delhi or in Bengal or Calcutta, wherever he spent the greater part of his life, represented this synthesis of various cultures which have come one after another to India, rivers that had flowed in and lost themselves in the ocean of India life, India's humanity, affecting them, changing them and being changed themselves by them.

So, he came to represent more specially the culture of India as affected by the culture of the nations of Western Asia, the Iranian culture, the Persian Culture, the Arabic Culture which affected India for thousands of years — especially Iran — as every one knows. So, in that sense, I said that I can hardly conceive of any other person coming who can replace him because there was already a change in the age which produced him and that age is past. A few of us are just relics, who have some faint idea of that age that is past.

I do not know if the generation that is growing up will even have any emotional realisation of that age. We are functioning in a different way; we think in a different way and a certain gap in mental appreciation and understanding separates us, separates the generations.

It is right we change; I am not complaining change is essential lest we become rooted to some past habit which, even if it was good at some time, became bad later. But, I cannot help expressing a certain feeling of regret that with the bad, the good of the past days is also swept away

and that good was something that was eminently represented by Maulana Azad.

There is one matter I should like to mention here a curious error to the expression of which I have myself been guilty about Maulana Azad's life and education. Even this morning, the newspapers contained a Resolution of Government about Maulana Azad. The error is this, that it is stated – as I have stated sometimes – that he went and studied at Al Azhar University. He did not do so. It is an extraordinary persistence of error of wide circles. And, as I said, I myself thought so. Otherwise, I would have taken care to correct it in the Government Resolution which has appeared today. The fact is that he never studied at Al Azhar University. He went, of course, to Cairo; he visited it as a visitor, to see it; but, he never studied there. He studied elsewhere. He studied in fact, chiefly in Calcutta, in the Arabic Schools as well as other schools. But he spent a number of years in Arabia. He was born there and he visited Egypt as he visited other countries of Western Asia. That is a different matter.

So, we mourn today the passing of a great-man, of course a man of luminous intelligence and a mighty intellect with an amazing capacity to pierce through the problem to its core. I used the word 'luminous'. I think perhaps that is the best word I can use about his mind – a luminous mind. When we miss and when we part with such a companion, friend, colleague, comrade, leader, teacher – call him what you will – there is inevitably a tremendous void created in our life and activities.

It is possible that the initial reaction may not be a full realisation of that void. The initial reaction is one of shock and sorrow. Gradually, as days pass, the void appears deeper and wider and it becomes more and more difficult to fill that place which was filled by a person who has passed away. But that is the way of the world and we have to face it. We have to face it not negatively but positively by devoting and dedicating ourselves to what he stood for and trying to carry on the good work which he and others who have left us – captains and generals of our peaceful forces who have worked for independence and progress and advancement of India who have come and who have gone leaving their message behind. And so, I hope though he may go, he will live and his message will live and illumine us as it did in the past.

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay City – Central): Sir, I associate myself completely with the sentiments expressed by our Prime Minister. In fact, it is very difficult to add to the picture that he has given us of the Maulana Sahib as well as the appreciation. It is no doubt that we who

came to the non-cooperation movement in 1920 and had been reared up in the national movement for so many years feel now that with his passing a sort of a whole period is summed up and that summing up has been done by the Prime Minister very well.

As he says, he reminded us of the encyclopaedists of the French Revolution and the leaders of the Renaissance. When I used to see him sitting either here or in the movement outside, I was reminded more of the great Arab leaders of the 10th century, combining philosophy, mathematics and something of Omar Khayyam's literature — all together. It is a beautiful personality and a beautiful ideology of the new period combined with all the grandness that was in the past.

I sometimes used to feel how Abul Fazal would have looked when he translated the Upanishads in Persian and I think Maulana was the same picture here. It was not a small thing, when 12 or 13 years ago, when the floods of communalism were sweeping away many persons, to stand like a rock on the ground of nationalism despite adherence to one's religion, one's own community. For the Maulana Sahib to remain with the national movement required tremendous courage. Many people were washed away in the flood. But Maulana Sahib stood there. Therefore, it is quite true to say that, surely, more great men will be borne, but the period that is passed cannot be filled up.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi); Mr. Speaker, Sir, it becomes difficult for us to pay our affectionate reverence to Maulana Abul Kalam Azad in silence; we have to speak and perform our duty to our leaders. I fully and completely associate myself with words that have been spoken by the Prime Minister. I believe that the demonstration day before yesterday and the public meeting yesterday show how instinctively the common people the great loss that the nation has suffered.

Sir, as the Prime Minister said, Maulana Sahib was the embodiment of a synthetic culture which had existed in India for the last few centuries, which had been enriched by many streams assimilated in India. It is the genius of our people that whenever they take anything from outside they put their own grab upon it, before accepting it, thus enriching themselves.

Maulana Sahib was the culmination of an age, an age which will not come back. He had the old world's courtesies which may not revive. But, even as he was the culmination of an era, he was also the beginning of another era. I remember, in 1912 when he published out his famous journal *Al Hilal* in Urdu, it was a revelation. A young man who did not know any of the modern European languages yet could talk of political and historical matters with a familiarity of the expert.

He rendered the greatest service to Islam, when he recognised that Islamic countries could only be saved from the clutches of Imperialism when India was free. One does not know whether he loved Islam more or he loved India more; it was absolutely a blend where there was no first or second but both were the first. And, he made his Muslim countrymen to realise that in India while working for the freedom of India they were also working for the freedom of the countries that in Europe are called Near East—and we call them West Asia.

Sir, he was a man of many brilliant facets. Any one of them would have given him fame. He was a great divine, and if he had just confined himself to the spiritual heritage of his people he would have been the first in the field, and so he remained, in spite of his political activities. He was a great orator; and if he had simply remained an orator the nation would have remembered him among the country's great orators. He was a great scholar and if he had devoted his life to scholarship, he would have produced valuable and learned books and he would have been the leader in that field, But he took to the political field. Let it be understood that he and some of the old leaders who took to politics were not taking to politics for its sake. They had to leave their professions; they had to leave pursuits dearest to their hearts; they had to leave things in which they could shine best. Why? Not for politics. Before Independence, there was no politics in India. There was only one thing and it was the love and service of the country that was lying low and that was in slavery. Many of us did not enter in politics and if we had been left alone, in normal circumstances, we would not have been in politics; but we would have gone on with the work dear to us. We had to interrupt our work because the country demanded it, and it was not politics but it was the love of the country that brought us into the political field. Maulana also, but for the condition in India, would have been one of our great scholars and one of our great divines. But his merit lay in this, that he thought that all scholarship, all knowledge of divinity and philosophy, all his historical knowledge, would be worth little if the country was not free. Therefore, Sir, he joined the national movement. He joined it when he was almost in his teens, and I had occasion to be in contact with him in those days. There were revolutionaries inside and outside India then and there were to be connections, and I was one of the persons entrusted with this liaison. Many times literature came from outside; letters came from outside and they had to be transmitted. I have very, very vivid memories of him before 1920. In 1920 we all realised that violent revolution was not the way to freedom and that what Gandhiji

had shown was the real way of rousing the masses and working for Independence.

Sir, it is very rare that people keep on throughout life in a revolutionary movement. It has been my experience that many, tired, fall by the wayside. A poet said it does not matter whether a spinner spins fine or he spins thick, but let it be that that thread does not break. And here, not only Maulana Sahib spun fine but the thread did not break. He had to suffer difficulties and humiliations. It is very difficult to stand out against the majority of one's community and to feel isolated. But he did not mind. He was insulted many times and he was a sensitive soul, yet he remained faithful to the cause that he had made his own and which he propagated throughout life, the cause of the independence of his country and its unity. Here was the person who has left a void in our nation. It is literally true, it is certain that we cannot fill that void. Maybe, as the Prime Minister said, that many people will rise; great people rise; great people have arisen in our history but the place of Maulana, I am afraid, cannot be filled. There are many who appear to be wise when they talk, but in the counsels they are not of much use. But here was a person who was not only wise in his words but wise in his counsels. He analysed the political situation with perfect clarity, and whether one agreed with him or not, one got wiser because of his analysis of the political situation.

Sir, it is said that there is, in our country the old guard. The gems of the old guard, are dropping one by one. I have to say in sorrow that we do not find that their places are being adequately filled. It may be that we may not have the gems again for some time to come, because, in the nation there is a period of creation and there is another period of silent gestation. So, it may not be possible to recreate the old giants, perhaps it may not be possible in a democracy, where the average man must rise. But I hope the gap created by the loss of exceptional people will be filled by the general rise in the average intelligence and average patriotism of the common people.

I pay my respectful homage to the great man who has just passed away.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Jaipal Singh.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West – Reserved–Sch. Tribes): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it seems like only the other day when more than forty years ago I met Maulana Sahab at Ranchi, where he was interned. I was only a school boy, very much in my early teens. The one thing that impressed

me at that first meeting was the enormous library that he had even while he was in internment. It seemed enormous to me because, as a school boy, of course, I did not know more than about half a dozen books; I did not possess any more. The impression he created in my mind then has persisted throughout my life.

To my way of looking at the whole picture, he was the one embodiment of cultural symbiosis in this country which should be an example to all of us if this country has to go ahead. He was not altogether what we call a contra-acculturationist. His symbiotic attitude to life is one which is the crying need of our country today, and throughout his political career he held up the banner unswerving, unnerved and unspent.

May I, on behalf of the Independent Parliamentary Group, say one thing more? And it is that today our thoughts very much go to the Leader of the House. It is difficult for most of us to imagine how he must be missing the prop that he found in Maulana Saheb. I can assure him personally that we should rally round him in the difficult task he has ahead of him, if ever he should feel lonely.

May I say one more word? And here I speak with authority, and certainly without fear of contradiction. Maulana Saheb was held in the highest esteem in Tribal India. May his soul rest in peace.

Shri V. Raju (Visakhapatnam): I rise to pay my tribute to the memory of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. What exactly does the Maulana Saheb's life mean to my generation, is something which I have been asking myself since the last two days. I am of the younger generation which the Prime Minister mentioned. To me the Maulana Saheb was a political leader whom I worshipped from afar – not only him, but all the other leaders of the national movement. The Prime Minister was one of them, Acharya Kripalani was another, and of course, there was always Mahatma Gandhi.

Today, to my generation, and to those who are younger than me, a very difficult question always poses itself. To the generation of the past and for those who are also living and who are colleagues of Maulana Saheb, there were very little problem. Personal problems there are always in life, but from an ideological and political standpoint, there was little or no problem. Nationalism was there, the love of the country was there, the fight for freedom was there, and towards that light we could all travel. In a sense I could term the struggle for national freedom as the ideal an objective of synthesis which always exists in our nation. There was no difficulty, but today in the world of sectarianism and in a world

where there are party differences and emphasis on politics and programme which vary, the problem of finding the true path is much more difficult, and it is, therefore, that the life of Maulana Saheb is such a great example for my generation. Because as I have already mentioned, personal problems exist; in addition to that there are also problems of emphasis, and the Maulana Saheb in his life had a problem of emphasis.

As we know, he was a Mussalman and had the problem of adjustment towards his community when there was the great problem of communal riots in the country. He was also a great nationalist. In a similar manner, there is to my generation the problem of emphasis, and we try to arrive at the beacon point of emphasis and work towards it, and the life of this great leader is an example of working towards this particular emphasis.

It is said that a person could well desire to live for a hundred years if he works without attachment, if his work is done with earnestness, but without desire. It is said that he and he alone can live for a hundred years, and that is message of synthesis and one-pointedness which the synthesised culture of India has given to all of us. I feel today that this lesson can well be learnt through the life of Maulana Azad. One can and should live a long life without attachment to the fruit of endeavour, and especially for us politicians and also only be arrived generation, truth can only be arrived at through one-pointed service without attachment.

This is the lesson that the Maulana gives to the younger generation, and I am sure that they will learn it and in the years to come from my generation and from the generations that will come, many great men will arise from this country and carry on the beacon-light shown to us by Maulana Azad.

Mr. Speaker : I associate myself with all the sentiments that have been expressed by the Leader of the House and the leaders of the various Groups here.

Maulana Saheb was a great national hero and a great patriot. He entered public life nearly fifty years ago, and his life has been one of dedication to the service of the motherland. His service and sacrifice were immense. He fought relentlessly and was a good fighter. In the winning of freedom, he was next to none. He was the right-hand person of Mahatma Gandhi. After the winning of freedom, he was a great architect of our new State.

He was a Member of the Constituent Assembly, the Provisional Parliament and the Lok Sabha, and he was the Minister of Education, when his body was laid at rest.

I pray to the Almighty that his soul may rest in peace.

He was a great theologian and divine. He was devoted to religion, but he never allowed his religion to interfere with his politics. These are the lessons that we have to draw from the life of the great soul that has departed.

I trust that the House joins me in conveying to the members of the bereaved family our deep sense of sorrow. His loss is irreparable to the Motherland.

I have to report to the House the unfortunate passing away of two other friends. Shri B. Das died yesterday at his residence in New Delhi. He was, and he can be, rightly called the 'Father of this House'. He joined the Central Legislative Assembly long before 1947, in 1923, and continued to be a Member for a number of years. He started during Motilalji's time as the Chief Whip of the Congress Party. He was an ardent worker. In the end, he was the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, in which capacity he did a lot of good service to our country.

We deeply mourn his loss. I trust the house will join me in conveying our deep sense of sorrow at his passing away to the members of his bereaved family.

I have also to inform the House of the sad demise of Shri V.M. Obaidullah, who passed away in Vellore on the 21st February, 1958, at the age of 53. Shri Obaidullah was a Member of the Provisional Parliament in 1951-52, and was a sitting Member of the Rajya Sabha when he passed away.

He was a good Tamil orator. Though he started his political career while he was quite young, he did a lot of propaganda for the country's casue, and he suffered immensely though he was poor. Irrespective of his poverty and his incapacity to suffer, he did suffer, and went to jail as often as it was necessary, and fought bravely.

We deeply mourn his loss also and shall convey to the members of his bereaved family our deep sense of sorrow.

I request the house to stand in silence for a minute to express its sorrow.

[The Members then stood in silence for a minute.]

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru : May I make a submission for your consideration and the consideration of the Chairman of the Rajya Sabha, that a portrait of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad painted by an eminent artist be placed in the Central Hall of Parliament?

Mr. Speaker: I most heartily welcome it. I am sure the House agrees with me that it is quite proper and appropriate that we should have Maulana Saheb's portrait. I am ready to receive the portrait when given. Even otherwise, independently, I am willing myself, on behalf of Parliament, to put up a portrait there.

As a mark of respect to the memory of the departed soul, the House will now stand adjourned and meet again at 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 25th February, 1958.

Document No. 48

Tributes to Maulana Azad in the Rajya Sabha on 24-2-1958

The Leader of the House (Shri Govind Ballabh Pant): Sir, we are meeting here today under the shadow of a great tragedy. The noble soul of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad departed from our midst on Friday last. Since the martyrdom of Gandhiji, the country has never been shaken so much as by this sad demise of Maulana Saheb. The entire nation is in mourning today. The vast crowds that lined the route from his residence to the Jama Masjid, attended the funeral when his body was laid at rest, and the huge gathering that was there in the memorial meeting yesterday testified to the universal esteem and affection in which he was held by the people of all classes, creeds and persuasions. Similar meetings have been held in all parts of the country. Tributes have been paid by the thousands. There has been in a way a spontaneous expression, almost universal, of the gratitude which the nation owes to Maulana Saheb for the services rendered by him continuously for more than 45 years. The history of India for the last many years would to a large extent represent the part played by Maulana Saheb in the making of that history. He was the embodiment of the synthetic culture of our country, which is our most precious heritage, and thus he represented in an abundant measure the forces of unity, tolerance, goodwill and friendliness towards all. He was a wise statesman, and ardent patriot, an intrepid fighter, and a profound scholar, who was respected for his learning not only in his own country but also in other lands. He guided the Indian National Congress and the country in the struggle for independence for many years. He also carried on negotiations with the Cripps Mission and other bodies and also with Wavell when the first conference met in Simla. He was a man who never wavered and never swerved from the path of truth and righteousness. He devoted his all to the good of others. He worked for human freedom, for the independence of India and for the unity of all living in this land.

We owe our independence to a large extent to leaders like him. His memory will ever be cherished with affection, and people will continue to derive inspiration from his life. He stood for the highest standards in public and also in private life. He has left an impress in all walks and he

will be remembered by generations to come for his nobility. He was a great man in the true sense of the word. We will not see the like of him again. The generation has come to an end, and we will only treasure the memory of such great men. He, as was remarked yesterday, was a beacon of hope and faith. He is no more in our midst. Not only the people but the Government too have lost a guide, one who stood for justice and fairness and for the best standards under all circumstances, and who worked with single-minded devotion in a selfless manner within as well as outside the Government. I can only pray that our country may be able to stand the shock, and that the objectives for which he stood, the aims which he always kept in view, and the principles which he actually practised, may continue to guide us.

I shall request you, Sir, to convey to the relatives the sorrow and the grief which we all feel and the sympathy which we have with them and with the entire bereaved nation.

Mr. Chairman¹: I should like to endorse the views expressed by the Leader of our House, Mr. Govind Ballabh Pant. Maulana Saheb was an outstanding figure of great courage, fearlessness, integrity and passionate love for freedom. He noticed the defects which make for subjection and struggled to the best of his ability to remove them. National dissensions have been a frequent cause of our repeated humiliation and subjection. He stood against them; he wanted to bring about the consolidation of our country. He made no difference between Hindu and Muslim, Sikh or Christian. He felt that all those who are in this country belonged to one country and that national spirit was the driving force of his life. He was an apostle of national unity and communal harmony, the lessons which we have to remember even now, since there are forces which are still at work in this country to divide us, one from another. This is one great lesson of his life.

Another thing which he taught us was the need for probity in administration. If we are lacking in it, the stability of the Government and the stability of our social structure will be undermined. He was much too fond of the right to prefer the wrong or the expedient. All along whenever questions of administrative integrity arose, he fought for preserving high standards in public administration. That is another lesson which we have to remember. There are forces which undermine Governments and bring about social upheavals, national dissensions, and lack of probity and integrity in administration.

1. Dr. S. Radhakrishnan.

When once freedom was won, he again felt that we must use that freedom for promoting social welfare, cleanse this country of sickness, squalor, illiteracy etc. and cleanse our minds of superstition, of obscurantism of fanaticism. He stood for, what one may call, the emancipated mind, the mind which is free from narrow prejudices of race or language, province or dialect, religion or caste. We had in Maulana Saheb the civilised mind.

Whenever I went to talk with him, he was full of quotations from Arabic and Persian. I do not know, but I am told that his command over these languages was unsurpassed and his speeches which he gave in Urdu, whenever he gave them, cast us into a spell. They were firm in their structure, dignified and polished in their diction, and cogent and pointed. I do not think that his place can be replaced in our country. He was a great figure in every sense of the term.

Let us remember that he worked for the ideals of national unity, probity in administration and economic progress. These are the things which we have set before ourselves. The only way in which we can honour his memory is for us to adopt these ideals and question ourselves every day whether in our acts we are promoting national unity, we are promoting integrity in administration, we are promoting economic and material progress. That is the one way in which we can imbibe the lessons of his life. There is no doubt that we will not see the like of him again — a great man, a man of stately presence, indomitable courage and fearlessness, that is what Maulana was.

I am sorry I have to refer to two other deaths of our members. Mr. V.M. Obaidullah Sahib. From the age of 16 he was a worker in the freedom movement. He occupied many distinguished positions. He was the President of the Tamil Nadu Congress Committee. At the time of his death he was the Vice-President of it and he was the Vice-President of the District Board. He was a Member of the provisional Parliament of India and he was elected to our Sabha again in April 1956. A quite unostentatious worker, it is such people who constitute the foundation of our nation. They may not be in the limelight but they are the people who contribute to the building of our great country. By his death also we have suffered a great loss.

I have to refer also to the death of Shri Bhubanananda Das, who for 35 years had been in parliamentary life. He was a Member of the old Legislative Assembly, the provisional Parliament, the new Parliament and lastly of our House. He was for a number of years Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and he discharged his functions with

fearlessness, with courage, with a sense of right and he could not be deflected from that path whatever may be the pressure or the temptation. He has left behind the example of a soul who was clinging to the path of righteousness even in difficult circumstances.

I therefore am sorry to refer to all these three deaths together on one day, Maulana Saheb, Syed Obaidullah Saheb and Mr. Das. May I request you to stand up for two minutes as a mark of respect to their memories?

(Hon. Members then stood in silence, for two minutes)

Mr. Chairman: I shall communicate to the members of the bereaved families our sense of great sorrow.

Mr. Chairman: The House stands adjourned till 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at twenty-one minutes past eleven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 25th February, 1958.

PART III: REMAINING DOCUMENTS

Document No. 49

GOVERNMENT OF BENGAL

Political Department

Political Branch

No. 4165 P.D.

From

**J.G. Cumming Esq., C.I.E., I.C.S.,
Chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal.**

To

**The Secretary to the Government of India
Home Department, Simla**

Darjeeling, the 16th October, 1913

Sir

With reference to the orders contained in para. 8 of Sir Harold Stuart's letter No. 326, dated the 1st March 1910, and in continuation of this Government's letter No. 3549-P.D., dated the 25th September 1913; I am directed to report, for the information of the Government of India that on the 26th September Mr. J.N. Roy, instructed by Messrs. B.N. Basu & Co., on behalf of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, editor and proprietor of the "Al Hilal", made an application for the formation of a Special Bench to hear an appeal against an order of this Government forfeiting the issue of the "Al Hilal" newspaper dated the 13th August 1913. The application, which was heard by the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Imam, was ordered to be filed on the understanding that the matter might be mentioned to the Chief Justice on the first opening day after the vacation.

2. I am to add that necessary steps are being taken to have Government adequately represented at the hearing of the appeal.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,
Chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal.

Document No. 50

Speech at A.I.C.C. Session of Bombay dated 7-8-1942

Opening the proceedings, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad referred to the Allahabad Session of the A.I.C.C. and said that the decision taken then was impelled by necessity. They might forget everything but they could not forget the decision taken then. On the failure of the Cripps mission the only cause open to them was to take the decision reached at Allahabad, namely, that for the effective defence of the country against foreign aggression the only course was to have the reins of Government in India's hands. When a nation was denied such authority, it could not effectively resist foreign aggression.

The menace of aggression to India was even increasing and the danger which only a distant one a few months ago was fast approaching them. In the face of such danger, it would be a calamity to allow the people to grow sullen and down-hearted. The Congress wanted to see that every Indian youth took part in resisting aggression. If the people of India were indifferent and sullen, the responsibility was not that of the Congress but that of the British Government. All appeals during the last three years to set up a national Government in India had been rejected by the British Government.

If events had been allowed by the British to take a different shape, Indians would have been whole heartedly engaged in the war. The British attitude was one of the not allowing Indians an opportunity to put their heart into the war in the service of humanity.

The alternatives. In the circumstances, said Maulana Azad, there were two alternatives before the country. The first was to wait for the events that might happen. The second was to act and save the country from the threatened invasion.

In order to instil enthusiasm into the people, they must be made to feel that in participating in the war they would be defending their own hearths and homes. One could not expect them to fight with sincerity unless they were that they were fighting for the protection of their own freedom.

The Congress, Maulana Azad emphasized, had already declared that its sympathies were with the democracies but there was no other way of saving India than by bringing about a political change in the country.

With the imminence of the danger from Japan, it was no longer so much a question of India's freedom but of India's protection. The fundamental test of the Congress demand, if it was granted, was whether it would hamper the effective prosecution of the war with all the responsibility which on him as Congress President, he had not the slightest hesitation in saying that the freedom would mean a new life in their war effort and the change would not endanger the cause of the United Nations. It must necessarily help the cause and the purpose of the war. It had to be remembered that what they wanted was that the reins of Government should be in Indian hands. They did not demand the withdrawal of such forces also from the country. But they did not realise that such a demand was not practicable.

They wanted the successful termination of the war in favour of Democracies.

If conditions were different, they would not have hesitated to demand the complete withdrawal of the British from India even if it meant enposing the country to the dangers of anarchy and civil war. The demand which was being put forward for a political change in the country was not of such a nature as to upset civil administration and law and order. They wanted a change which would help the prosecution of the war and not hiring about chaos. If fair play and justice prevailed, the British Government and their allies would not find them demand such as would hiring about chaos and disorder in the country.

It was sheer travesty to interpret the Congress demand in the manner interpreted by Sir Stafford Cripps.

The Congress President explained that the 'Quit India' demand did not mean the physical removal of all the Britishers from India. It only meant the transfer of political power to Indian hands. After the demand had been originally made by Mahatma Gandhi, both Pt. Nehru and himself had gone to Wardha to discuss the matter with Mahatma Gandhi who made it clear to them that it only meant the transfer of power.

Continuing Maulana Azad said that events had reached such a pass that there was no time either for threats or for promises. They must feel facts reasonably and act instantly. The Congress did not want promises

nor did they want to make promises. The need of the hour was action and action right now on the part of the Congress as well as the British Government. Let the British Government sign India's independence simultaneously." We will sign our agreement to the United Nations to fight along with them against all aggressors. He could say with all the emphasis at his command or speaking with the responsibility attached to the Congress Presidentship that they would be prepared to sign such an agreement. But were the intentions of the British Government honest? Were they willing to grant the independence of India?" Concluding Mr. Azad said the zero hour was fast approaching. They were making a final appeal to the British and to the United Nations and it was the duty of the latter to accept it if their eyes were not blind and their ears were not deaf.

Document No. 51

Statement dated 4-7-1945 regarding the Islamic Law

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad in a statement says: While I was in a detention at Ahmadnagar Fort, Reuters sent a report from Palestine that impressed itself upon my memory. It was the news that the ULEMA of Palestine had appointed a committee of Muslim jurists to revise and codify Islamic law (fiqh). Basing itself on the fundamental principles of Islamic law the committee would aim at a reorientation of Islamic law to meet the requirements of the modern age. It would first consolidate the four orthodox schools, viz., Hanafi, Shafe-Ee, Hambali and Malekee into one unified code. It would then select out of the consolidated manual the most suitable decrees and injunctions on specific questions.

“The Palestine Committee aims at meeting one of the most important social and religious needs of the Muslim world and is, therefore, welcome to all Muslims who realize the urgency of reform and progress. If the committee succeeds in achieving its object it will fulfil one of the cherished dreams of all Muslim reformers of the nineteenth century. They all dreamt such renaissance but could not see it realized in their life-time.

One of the foremost reformers of the nineteenth century was Sheikh Mohammed Abduhoo of Egypt. After the failure of the Insurrection of Zaraby Pasha, he was exiled to Beirut. While there, he submitted a memorandum to the Sheikhu-Islam of Constantinople. This was to urge him to take the lead in initiating a reform of Muslim Law. The attempt did not succeed as the time was inopportune. The regime of Sultan Abdul Hamid was so reactionary that even to speak of reform was a crime.

“The move of the Palestine committee is not a novel one. The foundations of the reform movement were laid by Muslim scholars several centuries ago. They were however, too far in advance of their age and the conservatism of the time could not accept their ideas. Sheikh Ahmed Ibn-i-Taimiah and his disciple Ibn-i-Qayyim urged a reform of Islamic law on the very lines now suggested by the Palestine

committee. Qadi Mohammad Shaukane, a well-known divine of Yemen, based his reforms on the same principles. These are embodied in his famous book, *Nail-Ul-Autar*, which is extant, and serve as a guide in our modern efforts for reform. All that we have to do is to build on these foundations and raise a structure suited to the need of the modern age.

Egypt is the greatest centre of Islamic learning in the modern world. It is for her to take the lead in carrying through such important reform. Sultan Ibn-i-Saud belongs to the same school of thought as Ibn-i-Taimiah and Ibn-i-Qayyim. One would expect him to be the standard-bearer of the new reform movement. It was however, neither Egypt nor Hejaz which took the lead and the move came from a quite unexpected quarter. The credit of Palestine is the greater as nobody could expect from her such a bold step.

The formation of the Palestine committee is thus an event of International importance. It is a pity that it has evoked no response from Muslims in India or elsewhere. While still in detention I decided that on my release I would welcome the move on behalf of Indian Muslims. I now offer my heartiest congratulations to the Palestine committee and can assure them that the enlightened and progressive ULEMA of India will render them all help and co-operation in their noble task.

Document No. 52

On Communal Question dated 14-7-1945

The Viceroy had to take as much responsibility in solving the communal question as the Indian parties themselves because the British Government could not absolve itself of its responsibility for the situation that had arisen. The existence of the third party was greatly responsible for the present position. A firm attitude on the part of the Viceroy, which was logical and based on the principle of justice and fairplay, alone could bring about a settlement of the communal problem. The Viceroy's present wavering and vacillating attitude was neither correct nor helpful. Hesitation and weakness could not bring about a solution.

The Congress President added that he was still optimistic and not pessimistic. He assured the Viceroy that the Congress would continue to show the same spirit of co-operation which it had brought to bear during the conference. Whatever the result of the conference, Lord Wavell had made the attempt in all sincerity. Difficulties had cropped up, but the Viceroy should not be baffled by them.

The Viceroy at this stage said that he appreciated the Congress President's observations. He was still not without hope of bringing about a solution. He knew that they all wanted a just and fair solution, but they should all bear in mind that expediency could not be excluded. He would continue his efforts to bring about compromise and adjustment.

Document No. 53

Azad, Wavell Plan and the Congress Dated 18-7-1945

The manner in which the Conference had been concluded today was now before the world and world opinion could easily judge at whose doors the responsibility for the failure should be laid, he said. So far as the Congress was concerned, it had been repeatedly made clear that it was prepared to take up responsibility of administration. If the British Government seriously intended to settle the issue, the Maulana said, they should have foreseen and realized the communal and other differences and should have been prepared to meet them. They should not have given the right of veto to any particular group to hold up the progress of the country. "Those who are prepared to go forward he said, "should be allowed to go forward and those who wish to keep out should be left out."

The Maulana prefaced his remarks by expressing his firm hope in an ultimate settlement. "Day before yesterday," he proceeded, in reply to a Pressman's question said, "I was hopeful and I am hopeful. I have given expression not only to my personal opinion but also that of the Congress as fully as possible in that phrase hopeful. The whole basis of our struggle was and is founded on hope. And remember we had then no idea whatsoever of the Wavell proposals. These proposals did not create any new hope in me. Even after my interview with his Excellency, when I realized that the negotiations would end, I was not without hope. Our hopes and aspirations are not bound with temporary offers and plans."

The Congress President explained the reasons for the Congress participation in the Conference. The proposals were presented to us suddenly. On June 15, I and my colleagues were released and we had to take a decision straightway on the plan. You can realise our difficulties. We were thrown into a new world and despite their difficulties the Working Committee decided to participate in the Conference. We realized that vast changes had taken place in the international sphere and those changes had undoubtedly repercussions on the Indian problem. In one hop and in a few years the world had traversed centuries. A new world was emerging.

"The inevitable result of the changes has been to bring to the forefront the question of Indian freedom and that of the freedom of the Asiatic countries. We are very near our goal and the next stage is the goal itself. It does not matter at all what are the intentions of the British Government."

The Maulana continued: "While fully bearing behind the fact that the present arrangement is purely temporary, interim, and should not possibly be regarded as a precedent for the permanent arrangement of the future, I should like to emphasize and make it perfectly clear that the Congress is essentially a national organization, and it cannot possibly be party to any arrangement, howsoever temporary it may be, that prejudices its national character, tends to impair the growth of nationalism or reduces the Congress directly or indirectly to a communal body."

After emphasizing the national character of the Congress organization the Maulana said that he attached considerable importance to the declaration that the provisional plan was intended as a preliminary step towards the achievement of the cherished goal of independence of India and to facilitate and expedite its achievement. He had also made it plain to His Excellency that the Congress Working Committee wished to co-operate in every reasonable way with a view to resolving the present deadlock, and Congress leaders had accordingly, in spite of adverse circumstances, come to Simla to participate in the conference. But whatever decision the Working Committee might take it would require to be confirmed and ratified by the All India Congress Committee. The fact that the A.I.C.C. and other Congress Committee were still under ban and large number of Congressmen were in internment, detention or imprisonment was creating serious obstacles in their way.

Maulana Azad explained the various issues on which he had sought clarification from his Excellency and said: "I can say that the replies received from the Viceroy were satisfactory." The issues on which he sought further light were:

The scope and function of the proposed External Affairs Department;

Every possible effort should be made to give a national character to the Indian Army and to bring about cordiality between the national Army, the national Government and the people. The present barriers isolating them will, of course, have to go;

After the present war in South East Asia, it must be clearly understood that the Indian Government cannot support any policy

aimed at the continuation of imperialist control of any of the countries of South-East Asia, nor can it allow the use of Indian resources for the deprivation of freedom of any of these countries.

In regard to the Indian States, while recognizing that during the interm period the powers of the Crown Representative will continue, it is clear that the National Government will have to deal with many subjects which overlap and have concern with the states in regard to trade, industry, labour and other things. The barriers between the State people, the Princes and members of the National Government and their associates should be removed so as to help in mutual discussions, consultations and consideration of common problems and their solution.

Amplifying his observation on the South-East Asian countries the Congress President said that so far as the present situation was concerned, if the new arrangement had been successfully reached the war against Japan would have become not Britain's war against Japan but India's war against Japan. There could not be two opinions as regards the question of liberating countries in South East Asia. It would be the duty of the new Government of India to carry on the war against Japan ceaselessly till those countries were liberated. But if it was the desire and intention of the powers that those countries should be restored to *status quo* then surely the new Indian Government would not be a party to it. They would not permit single Indian soldier or the expenditure of a single pie for the *status quo* of the South East Asian countries.

On the question of the Caste Hindu-Muslim parity which formed the basis of the new proposals, the Maulana said that he had impressed on His Excellency that in the constitution of the new Government the criterion should be the political views held by the parties not religious belief. However, the thing was there. The Congress did not wish to attach undue importance to the fact of a few more Muslims being in the Government or there being a few less Hindus. "I raised all these issues at the conference itself and I must say the replies which His Excellency gave were, to my mind, reassuring," said the President.

After the settlement of those fundamental issues the Conference came to consider the strength and composition of the new Executive Council. The Conference was adjourned to enable private and informal talks to be carried on amongst the parties for a settlement. "You know the conversations led to no results," the Maulana said. He added: "In the course of those informal talks the position taken up by Mr. Jinnah as that the Muslim League alone should nominate Muslim members for the new Executive Council. The Congress found that such a position

would be inconsistent with its basic national character. You must remember that as far as we are concerned, it is not merely a question of seats but one affecting a fundamental principle. We are prepared to accommodate the Muslim League but Mr. Jinnah took up an uncompromising attitude."

Continuing the Congress President said that the Viceroy had asked the various groups to submit lists of names from which His Excellency would choose after consultation with party leaders. Mr. Jinnah refused to submit names. "In the interview I had with His Excellency on July 12, he told me that so far as the Muslim seats were concerned he had endeavoured to prepare a list and seek Mr. Jinnah's approval. The Viceroy further told me that he did his best but failed to persuade Mr. Jinnah who insisted that the Muslim nominees should be nominated by the League Working Committee. The Viceroy was unable to agree to it and felt it was not profitable to proceed with the proposals at present.

"Two points arise out of the present," the President said. "The first is that the attitude of the Muslim League has been responsible for the failure of the Conference. The second point which emerges from the refusal of the Muslim League, that it was for Lord Wavel to decide whether to go forward or not. His Excellency has decided not to proceed for the present. In this connection I must say what I said at the Conference: The British Government could not absolve themselves of the responsibility for the communal problem here. So long as the third party remains these difficulties will remain as pawns on a chess-board and will continue to move in this fashion whether it is today or tomorrow they must take up a firm stand on a just and fair basis. There is no other alternative but to do that. And once a decision is taken we must move forward.

"Those who are prepared to go forward must be allowed to go forward and those who wish to be kept out should be left out. Without determination nothing could be done. Wavering minds and faltering steps will never carry us forward on the path of progress. We must think before we take a step. And once we decide hesitation is no virtue but a sign of definite weakness. There is nothing new in this so-called communal problem.

"I have no regrets whatsoever for the Congress stand in this Conference."

Besides what he had said, there were certain details about the proceedings of the conference and there was certain correspondence

which he had exchanged with His Excellency. He was not at liberty just now to reveal that correspondence but the country must know all about it to have a correct picture of the situation. He had written to His Excellency for its release and he hoped it might be published shortly.

The Congress President was asked that both the Viceroy's broadcast as well as the White Paper referred to agreement amongst parties for the success of the plan and as such the Government could not be blamed for the failure of the Conference. The Maulana replied: "That is true. We accepted the invitation knowing full well the position. But that certainly does not mean that any group should be given the right to veto or that any group should be allowed to impede the progress of the country. It should be seen that no party takes up a stand which is obviously wrong. There could never be perfect unanimity."

In reply to an other question, the Congress President contested the claim that the Muslim League was the sole representative and authoritative organization of the Muslims of India. In all the provinces where Muslims were in a majority there was no League Ministry to talk of. There was Congress Ministry in the Frontier Province; Unionist Ministry in the Punjab; in the Sindh Sir Ghulam Hussein Hidayatullah depended on Congress support and the position in Assam was similar. It could not therefore, be claimed that the Muslim League represented all the Muslims. There was large block of Muslims who had nothing to do with the League.

Attitude to Communists

Asked about the Congress attitude towards the activities of the Indian Communists, Maulana Azad said that there were very serious complaints about their behaviour. They could not, however, anticipate what decision the Congress would take when it is in a position to take the decision in accordance with normal procedure.

Document No. 54

Appeal for the Memorial on Tagore dated 24-7-1945

The Congress President, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, has congratulated the British Premier-elect, Mr. Clement Attlee, on the election results.

In a cable to Mr. Attlee, the Congress President says: Hearty congratulations to the people of Great Britain on behalf of Indian people on the results of the elections which demonstrate their abandonment of old ideas and acceptance of a new world.

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad has issued the following statement on July 24, at Calcutta lending support to the Rabindranath Memorial Fund.

Maulana Azad says: "It is a matter for shame that we have not raised as yet a fitting memorial for Dr. Tagore. Perhaps he needs no memorial other than the songs we cherish in our hearts. It is, however, our duty to see the objects for which he laboured even to the end of days are maintained as he would have liked to maintain them. The Visvabharti is the living symbol of his hopes and dreams. We must ensure that it continues to serve the ends for which he founded it."

Document No. 55

To the Congressmen dated 27-7-1945

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the Congress President, has issued an appeal to Congressmen all over India to observe the ninth of August in a proper and befitting manner and to devote the whole of the week, following the constructive programme.

He says: "The week following the ninth of August has been declared as a national week in various provinces. I would in this connection issue the following directions to Congressmen all over India. We must permit no word or action that may mar the solemnity of the day. Noisy demonstrations and cheap rhetoric are an insult to the memory of those who have fallen. Our only fitting homage is to work for the cause for which they died. Lack of organization and discipline has been one of the fatal weakness in our national struggle. We must pledge ourselves to overcome such weakness. In the changed circumstances of today the constructive programme offers the only means of welding ourselves into disciplined soldiers of Indian freedom. Through the constructive programme we must therefore rehabilitate our people and garner our strength.

"I would appeal to Congressmen all over the land to observe the ninth of August in a proper and befitting manner. There must be no exuberance in word or action but a dignified and well-ordered display of our national will to freedom. Where there is no ban on public meetings they should be held at 6 p.m. to renew our pledge to the country. Where such ban exists, meeting should be held in private quarters at the same time or hour. There should be no speeches except by the President of the meeting. He should briefly explain the nature of our peaceful and non-violent struggle and emphasize the importance of the constructive programme.

The audience should then stand in silence for two minutes in memory of those who have been taken away from our midst in the last three years. Meetings should then disperse in orderly and dignified silence. The whole week should be observed as one devoted to the constructive programme.

In a cable to Sir Stafford Cripps, Maulana Azad says: Congratulations from one who despite differences in respect of solution of the Indian problem has always been convinced of your sincerity of purpose and grateful for your endeavours on behalf of India."

"India will watch and wait," said Maulana Azad when interviewed by the ASSOCIATED PRESS of India this morning on the Labour Party's victory. The Maulana said: "The victory imposes a heavy responsibility on the Labour Party. The world is waiting to see if they can avoid the mistakes committed at the end of the last war."

The Congress President added: "The British elections are momentous for the future of the world. More important than the man for whom the British people have spoken so unequivocally are the issues that decided their choice. The results are a signal victory of new ideas over old and prove that the people of Britain have decided to discard the old and worn-out order."

Document No. 56

Message to Generalissimo dated 16-8-1945

Maulana Azad sent the following message to Generalissimo Chiang-Kai-Shek on the victory of China over Japan (on August 16, 1945 from Gulmarg):

“With feeling of profound relief may I take this opportunity to offer my sincerest congratulations to the people of China on the victory over Japan.

For eight years, the indomitable spirit of the people of China had to struggle against the overwhelming forces of aggression and endure undared and soul wearing agony.

The story of these unquenching and passionate determination to regain their freedom at the cost of countless sufferings will constitute a glorious chapter of the world's history and will continue in spite of all those who cherish freedom as their birthright and who still struggle to attain it ”

Document No. 57

Interview to the Press dated 17-8-1945

Maulana Azad said in an interview to the Press on August 17, 1945, at Gulmarg that news of the commutation of the death sentences of the Chimur and Ashti prisoners would be received in the country with sense of grateful relief.

He revealed that he had also addressed an appeal on their behalf to the new Secretary of State for India.

Document No. 58

For Permanent Political Solution dated 20-8-1945

The war which has just ended led to the postponement of many urgent problems. In some cases this was inevitable. In others, the war was made an excuse for such postponement. The final end of the war has suddenly brought all these problems to the forefront and war conditions can no longer be pleaded as an excuse. Both from the national and international points of view the question of India's freedom, political and economic, is now an urgent and vital issue on which depend not only the well-being of 400,000,000 but also to a large extent the future peace of the world.

"This question always vital and important, has now been precipitated to the very forefront and there can be no further delay in its solution. The solution has now to be a final and permanent one. Such a settlement can only mean the establishment of a democratic government for a free and independent India co-operating in the international domain with the other free governments of the world. As a part of this settlement, and for the brief period between now and the assumption of office by the Government of free India under a constitution framed by the Constituent Assembly, interim governments both in the Centre and the provinces will be necessary in order to deal with the acute distress prevailing in the country and with post-war problems, as well as to arrange the preliminary processes of the Constituent Assembly. But such interim arrangements can only be possible as a part of the final settlement.

"It has been stated on behalf of the British Government that a Constituent Assembly should be summoned at the conclusion of hostilities. Hostilities have now ceased. The only excuse that may be advanced for a possible delay in convening the Constituent Assembly is the lack of a solution of the communal problem. This should offer no difficulty as the Indian National Congress has gone a long way to find a solution.

In regard to the Hindu-Muslim problem, as it has taken shape today with the demand on the part of the Muslim League for a partition of the country, the Congress has given the most earnest consideration to it,

desiring as it does, the well-being and freedom of the country as a whole and of each group or community in it. It has even recognized the right of self-determination of any area provided that this is the established and declared will of the inhabitants of that area, but subject to the exercise of such right not resulting in the compulsion of any other group.

“The Congress is convinced that the free Indian State can only be based on the willing co-operation of its federating units and of its principal communities and cannot be founded on compulsion. Further the Congress has declared that the federating units should have the largest conceivable amount of freedom to function as they will, subject only to certain essential bonds for their common welfare. Even independent countries adjoining each other have to develop these common bonds and links and can no longer live in isolation.

“Thus the Congress has gone to the farther limit in recognizing the right of self-determination to the extent of separation under certain circumstances and with certain safeguards for the communities affected and for the country as a whole. It had done so in the earnest hope that when the problems are viewed in proper perspective and without passion and prejudice, the facts of the situation will induce all concerned to co-operate together in building up a free and democratic Indian State, with every freedom to the constituent units to develop according to their needs and wishes. But if any such unit or group of adjoining unit decides otherwise, it can take charge of its own destiny. It will be open to the representatives of such a unit in the Constituent Assembly to advance its claims and a decision on this should not rest on the majority vote of the assembly but on the vote of the representatives in the assembly of the areas concerned.

“While the Congress position is clear, doubts and suspicions have not wholly disappeared and I feel that in order to remove these some clarification is needed. I propose, therefore to place this matter before the next meeting of the Working Committee and I am confident that the desired clarification will be forthcoming.

“So far as I am concerned, after long and careful deliberation I have come to the conclusion that the division of India is wholly impracticable and opposed to the ultimate interests of Indian Muslims themselves.

“But I realize also that the present political atmosphere of the country is surcharged with suspicion and doubt and a large section among the Indian Muslims does not seem to be in a mood to view

realities in their proper perspective. This section can be expected to do so only when it is assured that the determination to their destinies rests with Muslims themselves without external compulsion. When this is realized, suspicion and doubt will largely disappear and efforts to reach a desirable and mutually satisfactory solution of the communal problem will be fruitful.

“In the great tasks before us, all of us must get rid of the fear complex. I appeal to my fellow Muslims to view the question in this perspective realizing that their future lies in their own hands and there can be no compulsion on them. I appeal also to my Hindu and Sikh and other fellow-citizens to appreciate this approach to a problem which has troubled us so much and has been a bar to our progress.

“With this approach on the part of Muslims and Hindus and Sikhs, I have no doubt that the atmosphere of distrust will undergo a change and give place to a climate of mutual trust. Even the section of Muslims I have in view can then be trusted to begin to examine the question of separation dispassionately.

“It should be borne in mind that if the right of self-determination is conceded to any area in such circumstances as prevail in our country, it is not to encourage fissiparous tendencies but to remove the very cause of distrust and, therefore, the desire for separation.”

Document No. 59

Homage to Netaji dated 25-8-1945

“The tragic circumstances in which Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose is reported to have died in exile will be learnt with grief in India,” says Maulana Azad in a statement from Srinagar on August 25, 1945 on the reported death of Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose.

“From his youthful days, he was passionately devoted to the cause of Indian freedom and pursued his aim with uncommon zeal and single-mindedness. He attained a high place in the estimation of his compatriots at an early date and was rewarded with the highest office in the gift of the nation.

“His patriotism was beyond doubt and but for the wrong step he took at a critical juncture he might have been in our midst today. It is extremely sad and tragic and that a life of much promise has met with a premature end in circumstances which everyone in India will regard with sorrow.

“I cannot help thinking today of Mr. Sarat Chandra Bose and other members of the family who came under a cloud of suspicion on account of deceased's ill fated association for a long period. Now that the war has ended and even Subhas Chandra Bose is no more, there is no reason left for prolonging the incarceration of any of them any longer.

“Demand for their release has been repeatedly made by influential sections of their countrymen and I earnestly hope that the Government will no longer hesitate to set them free.”

Document No. 60

On I.N.A. Prisoners dated 31-8-1945

“The Govt.’s decision about the prisoners of the commonly known Indian National Army while recognising the special circumstances of the case proposes that the leaders of the Army should be tried by Court Martial and the law should take its course. This sounds ominous. It is commonly believed that in spite of the grave error of judgement there prisoners had no intention to embrace the Axis Cause but were moved by patriotic motive. The circumstances in which they are believed to have acted were extremely complex. Now that the war is over Indian sentiment and public opinion will be in no case sanction the extreme penalty. I would not like to enter into the intricacies of international law but according to legal opinion the question of their status as British Indian subjects is not so simple and their trial by Court Martial would lack validity. In as much as the peculiar circumstances of their cases invite the saving provisions of international law, the liabilities should be judged by higher moral principles and international customs. In any case it should not be forgotten that Indian sentiments and feelings in respect of the Indian National Army would in no case allow the extreme penalty to be meted out to those who were victims of wholly unprecedented and unexpected circumstances and who acted with no motive other than that of patriotism. If combatant armies receive the benefits of international law and custom, nationals of a country under foreign rule are morally entitled to nothing less.”

Document No. 61

On Communalism dated 5-9-1945

On his attention being drawn to some reactions to his recent statement about self-determination, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the Congress President said on September 4 at Srinagar: "A careful examination of the Congress resolution and my last statement on the subject of self-determination will make it clear to anyone that it is the population of a well-defined unit or area whose right to self-determination is recognised. Obviously if a considerable majority of the population of such a region is Muslims their decision will be the decision of the area concerned. But it does not mean disfranchisement of minorities living in the these regions.

"It is therefore, said in so many words that in whichever region the Muslims are in a majority they need have no apprehension that a decision which is not their own will be imposed on them. With this assurance made plain, it is for them now to examine the merits of union in an atmosphere free from extraneous interference with their choice. Extraneous interference here refers to the decision taken by persons not living in the areas concerned. I am deliberately confining myself to broad principle of self-determination and do not desire to examine its implications in detail. In brief, both the Congress resolution and my explanatory statement concern themselves with territorial units and not exclusive religious communities."

It is learnt from reliable sources that Maulana Azad wishes to place the issue of self-determination before the Working Committee at its forthcoming meeting at Poona so that a detailed statement on the self-determination question, fully clarifying the Congress attitude, could be issued.

Maulana Azad feels that contradictory interpretations being given to the Congress attitude are creating a lot of a misunderstanding and hence he considers it necessary that as far as possible all doubts must be removed.

The Congress President and Mr. Asaf Ali are giving deep thought to this question and invitations extended to Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan and Maulana Hussain Ahmed Madni for the forthcoming Working Committee meeting are more than significant in this connection.

Document No. 62

Statement to the Press dated 6-9-1945

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the Congress President, has issued the following statement on the Punjab Congress affairs (Srinagar Sept. 6, 1945):

"I regret that the pressing demands of the situation have constrained me to postpone my immediate engagement in Lahore, and now I have to proceed direct to Bombay. However, as soon as the business of the working committee and the A.I.C.C. is concluded I shall pay a visit to the Punjab.

"It seems to be necessary to inform the Congress circles concerned that I was fully apprised by Mian Iftikharuddin of his desire to be relieved of his responsibilities as President of the Provincial Congress Committee. His resignation will take effect after the next meeting of the provincial committee which has been summoned on the 27th of this month.

"In the meantime, having regard to the importance of the forthcoming elections to the Central Legislature it is essential that preliminary work a connection should not be delayed even by a day. The selection of candidates will be made by the Central Parliamentary Sub-Committee. The Parliamentary Sub-Committee may find it necessary to appoint a special representative to supervise the entire work connected with the elections. But Congress Committee should be individually canvassed for any candidates the Congress may put up.

Azad Urges Postponement of Elections

Maulana Azad, President of the Indian National Congress who arrived here in New Delhi by air afternoon from Srinagar, in an interview on Sept. 7, 1945 preferred the postponement of elections with a view to widen the franchise and revise the electoral rolls rather than hold the elections on the basis of the present, incomplete electoral rolls.

The Congress he said, has stood for adult suffrage for more than a quarter of a century and therefore, it cannot view with equanimity the deprivation of tens of millions of potential vote. It is a matter for

satisfaction that this is being realized in other quarters too and public protests are being lodged against the restricted franchise and defective electoral rolls on the basis of which the forthcoming elections are proposed to be held.

It would be a travesty of the principle of representation to exclude the bulk of the population from expressing their will and exercising their choice of representatives either for foreign Governments or for constitution-making body. Any election held on the basis of existing electoral rolls will be entirely valueless for it cannot reflect the will of the bulk of the adult population of the country. Considering the fact these elections will be prelude to the Constituent Assembly and the issues at stake are so vital a postponement of the election is called for.

Document No. 63

Statement to the Press dated 9-9-1945

Clarifying his statement on the right of self-determination for territorial units, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Congress President, told pressmen today in Delhi on September 9, that the existing provinces in which Muslims were in a majority could not be accepted as units for that purpose. He added that the Lahore resolution of the Muslim League itself did not make any reference to the provinces. Illustrating his point, Maulana Azad pointed out that, while considering the question of the Punjab, they could not force the Ambala division (where the Hindus were in a decisive majority) into joining a separate State. Similarly, in Bengal, Burdwan and Presidency Divisions could not be compelled to join the rest of Bengal into a separate State. The Congress President, made it clear that all inhabitants in the areas concerned would have the right to say whether they would join the Union or form a separate State.

It was obvious, he added, that in areas in which the Muslims were in a decisive majority, their opinion would largely affected the verdict of those areas.

In reply to question, the Congress President, pointed out that what he had said on the question of self-determination was an elaboration of the Congress Working Committee resolution of April 6, 1942. There was no question of going back on that resolution which had made it clear that the Congress could not think in terms of forcing any area to join the Union against their freely-expressed will.

Asked whether the resolution of April 6 had not been nullified by the Jagat Narain Lal resolution, the Congress President remarked that the two resolutions were not contradictory. The Congress did not want to force any unit to join the Union. He thought it was necessary to say so in order to build up a united Indian State on a sound footing. He was not without hope that those who were demanding separation would start thinking seriously, if they were told that they had free choice in the matter.

The Congress President was emphatic in his opinion that it was essential to make the Congress position clear on the question.

Document No. 64

Reply dated 26-9-1945 to the address of welcome

The view that political differences among Muslims should not lead to my conflict between groups and individuals and that all of them should practise toleration towards their political opponents was expressed by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Congress President, speaking at a reception arranged in his honour by the Muslim residents of Kucha Chelan, where the Maulana is staying. More than 100 leading Muslims of the locality including Mufti Kifit Ullah, Maulana Ahmed Saeed, Dr. Barkut Ullah, Mr. Jaffari, Mr. Abdul Rashid Ghazab, Seth Hyi Mohd. Yunas and Syed Aziz Hasan Baqal.

Replying to the address of welcome, Maulana Azad in a brief speech, thanked the residents of the locality, which he said had always been a gathering place for people of learning and patriotic fervour.

Referring to the present political situation, the Congress President said that they were passing through critical times. It was, therefore, natural that there should be acute political differences among them. Everybody had the right of freedom of opinion on political matters, he said, and therefore advised that they should do their best to avoid the development of political differences into a conflict. The Maulana appealed to the people to study the present day questions dispassionately.

Documen No. 65

Extract of Lahore Speech dated 7-10-1945

Maulana Azad was given a reception at Lahore on Oct. 7, 1945 by Sheikh Enayatullah of the Taj Company, one of the leading publishers in the country of the various editions of the Holy Quran. Many prominent Urdu, Persian and Arabic writers, scholars and journalists were also present.

In a welcome address, he hailed Maulana Azad as a great and towering personality of Muslim India and as the foremost theologian and authority on Islam in the world today. He said that no other man possessed that unique distinction or writing authoritative and exhaustive commentaries of the Quran. By that he had rendered a unique service to the Millat and had produced priceless wealth in the realm of the Quranic literature.

Maulana Azad, in reply expressed gratitude at this message of love and affection and paid a tribute to the Taj publishers for their work in publishing modern editions of the last and rapidly changing conditions of the modern world and the view of the ever new needs of the present times some more suitable editions of the Quran were needed to meet the requirements of the present age.

"There will be no peace in my heart until each and every one of us is out of jail," said Maulana Azad to the President of the Young India League, Mr. Prabodh Chandra, who interviewed him to discuss the question of release of political prisoners including student workers.

Document No. 66

Speech dated 7-10-1945 at Lahore

The Congress President, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad declared at Lahore on October 7, 1945 that it was his confirmed faith and belief that the future of Indian Mussalmans could be ensured and safe only by treading the path laid down by The Indian National Congress.

Speaking in chaste flowing Urdu, The Congress Persident said: "Judged by the viewpoint of their interests alone, Muslims would dispassionately come to the conclusion that the principles accepted by the Congress ensure their future status on the coming map of free India."

The Congress President was replying at a great reception arranged this evening by nationalist Muslims of the Punjab.

Maulana Azad said that he was happy to find himself among so many friends and dear ones. To his many Muslim friends present there he would say that India's political struggle had passed through various stages. "But now, since the caravan started 50 years ago, we are on the last stage of our journey. The end of the journey cannot be long. That much is certain. We have survived hardships and difficutlies on our arduous way. But we kept presisting onward to the goal. So all the arguments, discussions and debates as to the past problems have no relation to the present when the carvan is almost nearing its destination. Fix your gaze on the final objective."

The Congress President said that no doubt there were complexities in the political situation and unfortunate there was an air of mistrust and doubt and suspicion between the different organizations. There were doubts and suspicions in the minds of Muslims too. So far as the future of the country was concerned, those doubt had to be removed. On that there were no two opinions. At the same time the political struggle of India had reached its final phase.

There were varied facets of the communal question, he said. He was not going to mention them at the moment. "What is to be Muslims status in the India of the future? What is good for Muslims and what is bad?

How can Muslims make their future safe? What is in the interests of the country as a whole? There are questions to which we can find answers if we honestly and sincerely try."

"What is then to be the touchstone to distinguish the true from the false?" asked Maulana Azad. He said: "That touchstone for Muslim is this: that they should see whether by following the path to which we are inviting them they can safeguard their future. I can say this with confidence and I say this deliberately in the light of the realities which I have tried to see for the past 30 years that the prescriptions of the various Muslim organizations would not remedy the ills of Mussalmans. We cannot take them away from the cold, hard realities of the times by a few sentimental slogans or catch-words. In the light of these realities our path is the only right path. May be, for some time Muslims may be deceived by laying green pastures before them. But in this desert of declusion they will always be following the ever-receding will-o'-the-wisp and will never reach the desired oasis" (Loud applause).

"That is why," he said, "we are inviting Muslims to follow the way we have embarked upon, for this alone will ensure their future in the country. I am convinced that is how we can face the realities."

Maulana Azad said: "From world of fantasy let us step down to the world of realities. Then alone we shall be able to reach the right conclusion. We should measure ourselves by the standard we have set ourselves, and that standard is how we can ensure Muslim interests. All discussions and suspicions should cease in the light of the acceptance of the principles of self-determination, about which there has been so much debate. That discussion and debate is now meaningless in the context of the present problems."

Maulana Azad, thanking all those present, said that he would carry the pleasant burden of gratitude with him – the burden of the kindness of many friends and brothers and kinsmen.

Document No. 67

At a press Conference at Lahore dated 8-10-1945

A pointed reference to the question of the release of political prisoners throughout the country was made by the Congress President, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, addressing a Press conference in Lahore on Oct. 8, 1945.

The Congress President said that now when the war was over and the political situation had changed he did not understand why there was further delay in the release of the political prisoners in the country.

He said that at a time when the general elections in India were imminent this question had assumed particular significance and importance. If the political prisoners were not released soon it would mean that the election field was being narrowed for political organizations and limitations put on them. This would also mean that those who are in jail could not be put up as candidates to fight the elections.

Maulana Azad referred to his visit this morning to the Lahore Central Jail where he met five political prisoners who have been in jail for over 15 years. He said that in his correspondence with the Viceroy on the subject of political prisoners release he had been assured that the cases of such prisoners as had completed terms of more than 14 years would be immediately considered. The Congress President said he hoped that there would be no further delay in this matter and that they would be released soon.

He said in the Punjab, as his inquiries showed, there were still about 50 political prisoners in the different jails of the province and hoped their release would not be delayed any longer.

Replying to the question whether he agreed with Mahatma Gandhi's statement that the change of religion does not change the nationality, the Congress President said this way a very complicated question. Nobody had yet defined exactly what was meant by nationality but speaking in a general way he thought personally that nationality never changes with the change of religion.

Asked whether his statement from Kashmir on the question of self-determination did not differ from the Congress Working Committee's

resolution, the Congress President said that statement was to remove doubts as to the Congress stand on this matter and at Poona the Working Committee in its resolution had only clarified its position on this subject.

To the suggestion that his Kashmir statement accepted Pakistan, Maulana Azad said, "They have to re-read my statement."

Referring to the position of the Congress *vis-a-vis* the political organizations in Indian States, Maulana Azad said in the states where Congress Committee already existed the Congress did not want them to cease functioning, but it was advisable in view of the Congress decision in 1938, that political workers in state function in some other name like Praja Mandal, etc., in view of the peculiar conditions and difficulties and try to go as far as they can go.

The Congress President referred to the detention in Jail of Sardar Sardul Singh Caveeshar, Vice-President of the All India Forward Block, and said there was no reason why he was still being kept in Jail. He was sorry that he had not yet been released and the more delay in this release the more would be the anxiety among the public, about him.

Speaking about security prisoners he said so far as he knew there was nothing against them which distinguished them in any way from the political prisoners who had been released.

The Congress President was asked to say something about the Lahore Fort where some political prisoners were kept and about the allegations of third degree methods of torture employed on them. He said that this matter was under consideration and that he might have to say something on it later.

The Congress President was asked whether the report published in a Lahore paper that Maulana Azad was retiring from politics in view of his poor health was true. He first gave a roaring laugh and then said forcefully: "No. It is entirely wrong."

To the question whether there would be any understanding between the Congress and the Akalis in the Punjab, Maulana Azad said that this question rested with the Central Parliamentary Board of the Congress.

Maulana Azad referred to his work in the Punjab and said that the first thing that impressed him most on his visit this time to the province after nearly three and a half years was the tremendous enthusiasm of the people for the Congress. Before this he said he never found the people enthusiasm so great for the Congress in this province. "So far as the Muslims and Sikhs are concerned a new atmosphere is pervading among them in favour of the Congress.

He said that the Congress leadership in the Punjab had a very heavy responsibility. These new forces and this fresh atmosphere in favour of the Congress were a great strength which should not be allowed to waste and must be utilized in the right manner. He said he had no doubt that the Punjab would not lag behind any other province in the Congress Work.

The Congress President referred to the various sections in the Congress in the Punjab and the differences that had divided them and expressed gratification at the Punjab Congressmen's unanimous decision after his talks with them in electing Maulana Daood Gazanavi as President of the Provincial Congress Committee. By unanimously electing Maulana Daood Ghazanavi as President who, he said, comes from a family that occupied in the province an old, unique and distinguished place, the P.P.C.C. had given an earnest of the manner in which it would carry on its work in the future.

The Congress President said that he was sure that the Working Committee of the Punjab Congress would work unitedly as a team.

Document No. 68

On disenfranchisement of soldiers dated 18-10-1945

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the Congress President, who yesterday protested against the British Government's decision not to declare a general political amnesty in India, today the 18th of October, 1945 Calcutta, connected the issue with the forthcoming elections and asked, "How can there be free and fair elections when meetings cannot be held without the sanction of the police and candidates and supporters continue to be confined in Jails?"

Maulana Azad said: "The British Premier has more than once said that elections in India would be free and fair. Mr. Henderson; the Under-Secretary of State for India, has also recently stated in the House of Commons that there would be no restrictions on the right of free speech." The statement is untenable in the context of the present Indian situation where bans exist on public meetings, even in cities like Calcutta and Dacca or district like Midnapore.

Besides, large numbers of political prisoners and detenus are still in Jail. Among them are many who have been, are or may be members of the legislatures. To keep them under restraint is to restrict our choice in the selection of candidates, and also to deprive us of some of our finest workers during the election campaign.

The case of the Indian fighting forces presents another glaring example of restriction on free election. Lord Wavell in paying tribute to their splendid contribution to the victory of the United Nations, declared that "their opinions and views must be given due and proper weight at the time of the framing of India's future constitution."

"Maulana Azad also declared that it had been announced that every facility would be given to the soldiers to exercise their vote at the time of the next general election. It now appeared that the military authorities were either unable or unwilling to fulfil those promises and the reward of the gallantry of India's fighting forces was their virtual disenfranchisement in an election which is bound to influence the future of India.

The Congress President said: "He had received complaints from Bombay, Lahore and elsewhere that service personnel entitled to vote were not allowed to exercise their franchise in an unfettered manner as far the personnel stationed outside India, Mr. Henderson had informed the House of Commons that practical difficulties are such that it is not possible to overcome them in the time available."

"All difficulties were overcome for the British general elections" Maulana Azad said, "though the war had not yet ended at that time. Even personnel in the forests of Burma were enabled and encouraged to vote. I would therefore, urge the authorities to make necessary arrangements for enabling the Indian fighting forces to exercise their votes fully and freely as was done in the case of their British Comrades."

The authorities must also allow them the opportunity to know the programme and policy of the different political parties so that they can exercise their franchise with discrimination and knowledge; the barriers which now insulate them from Indian public life must go. How otherwise can we call the elections free and fair in face of the virtual disenfranchisement of large numbers of civilian and military personnel?"

Document No. 69

Statement to the Press dated 20-10-1945

“Things in Indonesia and Indo-China have now come to point when the Indian National Congress will have to seriously consider what steps it should adopt to prevent the use of Indian men and materials against Asiatic peoples fighting for their freedom,” said Maulana Azad, the Congress President in a statement on October 20, 1945 at Calcutta.

He added that Indians, who were fighting for their own freedom and democracy, could not but sympathize and fall in line with the struggle of Indonesian and Annamita nationalists.

Maulana Azad added: “Conflicting reports have tried to create confusion regarding the situation in Indonesia and Indo-China, but one thing stands out clearly in the midst of all of them. That is the unflinching resolve of the peoples of Java and Indo-China to secure for themselves the freedom and democracy which western states men have declared to be the chief objectives of the last global war.

“The character of this true people’s war has been instinctively recognized both by the workers and the exploited classes of the world and their imperialist masters and exploiters. We therefore, find on the one hand the dock and the port workers of China and Australia refusing to load munition and other war materials for use against these East Asiatic nationalists, and on the other hand, the British French and Dutch imperialists joining forces for restoring the *Status Quo Ante Belium*.”

Document No. 70

Clarification about Sardar Patel dated 1-12-1945

“It is wrong to suggest that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel have ever said that those who stood for the principle of self-determination have no place in the Congress”, says Maulana Azad in a letter to Mr. Abdul Rauf, President of the local Nationalist Muslim Students’ Federation.

“What Sardar Patel said at Bombay at the recent meeting of the All-India Congress Committee was only a retort to Mian Iftikharuddin that the latter had no place in the Congress, when Mian Iftikharuddin suggested that the Muslim League had become in Mussalmans what Congress was to the Hindus. The retort was however, inopportune.”

Maulana Azad adds that he had explained at the end of the debate that Congress attitude towards the principle of self-determination was not affected by a settlement or otherwise with the League.

Replying to another question, Maulana Azad said that the rejection of Mian Iftikharuddin’s resolution which called for acceptance of the Muslim League demands, was not consistent with his own stand regarding the question of self-determination, as enunciated in his statement issued at Srinagar.

Concluding the Congress President said that it was untrue to suggest that the Congress had adopted any Hindu Mahasabhaite as its candidate during the recent elections to the Central Assembly.

Document No. 71

About the attack on C.P.I. office dated 31-1-1946

“Press reports about the attack on the headquarters of the Communist Party in Bombay reveals a state of affairs which deserves the serious consideration of all those who are concerned with the growth of healthy public life in the country” says Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Congress President in a statement on 31 Jan. 1946, in New Delhi.

“How and why the attack originated is not clear,” add Maulana Abul Kalam Azad “but the facts as reported are highly deplorable. Public life will become an ugly fratricidal strife if violence is permitted to be employed between different groups holding different views.

“Howsoever, violently opposed a political party may be to others it must be allowed to function normally and under no circumstance should it be subjected to violence. I strongly condemn the behaviour of those who are guilty of violence against the Communists in Bombay. We must never forget that every one is entitled to his own views and every one has a right to express his views without running the risk of molestation.”

Document No. 72

To the Congress Ministries dated 7-2-1946

“The first and foremost duty of Congress Ministries would be to endeavour to ease the food situation in the country,” said Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Congress President to the United Press representative while boarding the Assam Mail on February 7, 1946 for his trip to Shillong.

“It was shocking that in an agricultural country like India there should be such frequent recurrences of food shortage,” added Maulana Azad who expressed great concern over press reports about famine conditions in several areas in Bombay, Madras and Rajputana besides Bengal.

Continuing the Congress President informed the United Press that the food situation and the parliamentary position in different provinces would figure prominently before the next meeting of the Congress Working Committee which was going to be held in the first week of March.

Reference to Sind Affairs

Interviewed by the Associated Press of India regarding the reported possibility of the European Group supporting the formation of a League Ministry in Sind Maulana Azad said that he would not be surprised if such a thing happened and in that case the Congress would form the Opposition. The Congress, which could simultaneously give up offices in eight provinces following the outbreak of the war, was always prepared for such eventualities.

Document No. 73

Interview to the Patrika dated 12-2-1946

"The Bardoloi Ministry which has taken over will be strong and stable," said Rastrapati Maulana Azad when interviewed by the "Patrika" representative.

Rastrapati said that as far as Congress was concerned there would be no objection to form a Coalition with the League provided it was based on a common programme of work.

He added that he told Sir Md. Saadulla that if the Muslim League Party of Assam would accept the Congress parliamentary programme as the basis of Coalition there would be no difficulty in forming a composite Ministry.

He further disclosed that the offer to Sir Md. Saadulla had been still kept open and he had left instruction to Mr. Gopinath Bardoloi to take necessary action.

The Congress President said that in the general election of 1936-37 many groups were found in the Assam Assembly. But in this election one good result was that those small groups had vanished and the Congress Party had come back with a solid group of 58 members. Three Muslim members who had been returned on the All-India Muslim Parliamentary Board ticket would also work with the Congress group. In this way this group would have 61 members. Therefore the Ministry which was now taking over would be strong and stable. Out of nine Ministers, three had been reserved for the Muslims. One of this was being filled by the immediate inclusion of Maulvi Abdul Muttilib Mazumdar. Two other places had not at present been filled.

When he reached Shillong on the 8th Feb. 1946 said the Congress President, an old acquaintance approached him and asked whether it was possible to extend the same offer of coalition to the Assam League Party as was done in the case of Sind. Maulana Azad told him that the case of Sind was on a different footing from that of Assam, nevertheless as far as the Congress was concerned there would be no objection to form a coalition with the League provided it was based on a common programme

of work. Maulana Azad told him further that if Sir Md. Saadullah the leader of the Assam Muslim League, was willing to have a discussion in this connection, he would be pleased to see him. Accordingly they met the same evening and had a discussion. Maulana Azad told Sir Muhammad that if the Muslim League Party of Assam would accept the Congress Parliamentary programme as had been elaborated in its Election Manifesto as the basis of coalition, there would be no difficulty in forming a composite ministry. Sir Muhammad expressed his inability to give his reply immediately and wanted time to get into touch with the League Parliamentary Board for a direction in the matter. Therefore it was decided that the formation of the ministry would be postponed till the following evening.

Next evening Sir Muhammed sent a letter stating that till then he had not been able to come to any decision and it would be better that the formation of the ministry should no longer be delayed. Accordingly Maulana Azad advised Mr. Gopinath Bardoloi to submit to the Governor a list of seven members of the Cabinet leaving out two seats for Muslims. Maulana Azad felt that the League Party had not sufficient time to consider and decide the matter and therefore it was desirable that they should wait for some time regarding the selection of the two more Muslim ministers. He was today (Feb. 11) leaving for Calcutta but he would keep the offer open. As soon as the League Party was able to come to a decision, Mr. Gopinath Bardoloi, the Premier,¹ would take the necessary steps in this matter.

Regarding the composition of the Cabinet, Maulana Azad said that as far as possible consideration had been given to different interests. But the basis in coming to a decision was the efficiency and ability of the persons selected. In this province among backward people were tribes of hills and plains. The Congress was alive to the interests of the backward people. This was evident from the fact that two members belonging to the plains and tribals were given nomination for seats reserved for general constituencies. In considering the personnel of the cabinet the case of those returned from plains and tribes were also given consideration but it was not found possible to include them just at present. Nevertheless the Congress President wished to assure them that their interests would be properly safeguarded. The door for their inclusion in the Cabinet would also remain open and wherever any qualified person was available he would be taken in.

1. Of Assam.

Document No. 74

Statement to the Press dated 14-2-1946

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the Congress President, has issued the following statement: on Feb. 14, 1946 (Calcutta) I am grieved to learn that some people are harbouring feelings of ill-will against the civilian Nepalese who reside in various parts of the city. They think that the action of the Gurkha Military should be avenged on all the Nepalese. If it is true, it is very regrettable. I would appeal to all the citizens not to give way to such evil feelings and they should try to bring it home to mothers also.

The Gurkha employed in the army have no grudge against Indians. When they carry out orders of their officers, they do so because they have been trained to follow the military discipline as a soldier, and they have no capacity to understand anything further. It would be criminal to hold all Nepalese responsible for it and to avenge on them.

Document No. 75

Remark dated 15-2-1946 on Calcutta Incident

Regretting the incidents that are taking place in Calcutta for the last two days, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the Congress President, appeals to all the citizens to try their best to stop the spread of hooliganism in the city.

Maulana Azad, who returned from Shillong on 12th Feb. 1946 in a statement issued to the Associated Press of India on the same day, says:

“On my arrival here at Calcutta at 2 P.M. from Shillong I was extremely shocked to hear of the incidents taking place in Calcutta for the last two days. I am making an enquiry and shall probably be able to give a detailed statement shortly. But it is obvious from the reports that the bad character of the city are inflaming sentiments of young men and utilising the situation for their nefarious ends. I would appeal to all the citizens to try to stop the spread of hooliganism. Those who are engaged in holding up traffic damaging military vans and other wanton acts are doing a great disservice to the best interests of the country. It is the duty of every Congress worker of the city to stand up for the preservation of peace and order.

Document No. 76

Statement to the Press dated 20-2-1946

The Congress President Maulana Abul Kalam Azad in a statement from Calcutta on Feb. 21, 1946 says that if the British Government fail to honour the September 1945 declaration in letter and in spirit, the Congress will consider the necessary steps for a final and decisive struggle. The Congress decision to wait and watch should not be constructed as unwillingness to fight.

He adds that so long as the Congress decides to wait on events, no attempt should be made to disturb the peaceful atmosphere or create sporadic and disjointed movements.

When the time comes, the Congress will give the call for struggle and will expect every Indian to respond to the call. He particularly appeals to the youth of India to realise the wisdom of Congress policy and obey it as disciplined soldiers.

The following is the text of Maulana Azad's statement:

"I am frequently asked about the present policy and future programme of the Congress and consider it my duty to state it as clearly and as unambiguously as I can.

The only problem before India is the immediate realisation of the country's independence. The British Government has made a declaration in Sept. 1945. The Congress does not consider it satisfactory, but nevertheless, after considering all aspects of the situation, has decided to take the declaration at its face value. It has accordingly decided to participate in the election and form governments in the provinces. It will wait for the result of the provincial elections and watch what steps the British Government, thereafter, take. If the British Govt. then make an unequivocal declaration of India's independence, form a provisional national Government in the Centre as an interim measure, and convene a Constituent Assembly to frame the future constitution of free India, well and good. The Congress will welcome such solution of the Indo-British problem through peaceful means. It would be futile to look for precedents in history. The world has changed beyond recognition and

a new chapter of human history is in the making. We are living on the threshold of a new world, and I believe that in the changed circumstances of to-day such a peaceful solution is not beyond the range of possibility.

The alternative is also clearly realised by the Congress. If the British Government fail to honour the September declaration in letter and in spirit, the Congress will consider the necessary steps for a final and decisive struggle. Let there be no misunderstanding on the point. The Congress decision to wait and watch should not be construed as unwillingness to fight. When the situation demands, the Congress will issue the call and demand from India the utmost sacrifice for realising its goal of Indian freedom.

One other point must also be stated, if there are any individuals or groups who want to impose a movement on the Congress at a time not chosen by it, I want to tell them with all the emphasis at my command that the Congress will repudiate all such attempts.

The Congress leadership has weathered many storms and proved its capacity both for sacrifice and decision. They know when to negotiate, and they also know when to strike.

Today, the issue has become simplified and concentrated to the one supreme question of immediate realisation of independence. If that is gained, all other objectives are automatically realised. There is an Arabic saying: 'If you have got hold of the stem, you need not bother for the branches.' In such context, no other question, however pressing or acute, should be allowed to distract our attention or divide our energies. So long as the Congress decide to wait on events, no attempt should be made to disturb the peaceful atmosphere or create sporadic and disjointed movements. When the time comes, the Congress will give the call for struggle and will expect every Indian to respond to the call. I particularly appeal to the youth of India, who are the vanguard of our freedom movement to realise the wisdom of Congress freedom movement, to realise the wisdom of Congress policy and obey it as disciplined soldiers."

Document No. 77

Statement to the A.P.I. dated 22-2-1946

The Congress attitude towards any possible interference from Governors in provinces where Congress Ministries are being formed was explained by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the Congress President in a Statement to the "Associated Press, On February 22, 1946 from Calcutta".

Maulana Azad said: "Now that a Congress Ministry has taken office in Assam, and will soon do so in other provinces, I have been asked by many why Congress has not asked for any assurance of non-interference from Governors.

Those who ask for such questions remember that such assurance were demanded and obtained in 1937, but they do not remember that 1946 is not 1937.

The intervening years have seen revolutionary changes all over the world, and nowhere have the changes been more revolutionary than in India. In 1937, it was necessary to ask for assurances, and even then Congress Ministers had to threaten resignations over the question of release of political prisoners. Now that it is a settled fact that power is to be transferred to the Indian people, the Congress has decided to accept office in provinces and wait for the formation of a provisional Government at the Centre.

To ask for assurance in such a context is to undermine the position already achieved. If there are any differences between Ministers and the Governor it will be the Governor and not the Ministers who will have to resign."

Document No. 78

On British Imperialism dated 24-2-1946

The demand that the British people should press for the abandonment of imperialism in India was made by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, President of the Indian National Congress, in a telegram to the British Centre Against imperialism which held its inaugural conference at London on 25th February, 1946.

“The future security of the world demands friendship and amity between the Indian and the British people,” said Maulana Azad. “But the British people must first discuss the old methods of Imperialism and exploitation before such an era of goodwill can commence. I hope that the British Centre Against Imperialism will devote all its resources to changing the heart of the British people. Their efforts in this direction will be real contribution to the future peace and programme of the world.”

Document No. 79

On R.I.N. Strike dated 28-2-1946

The Congress President, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad in an interview on 28th February 1946 on the recent happenings in the R.I.N. said that it was true that discipline in the army was a matter of supreme importances, but, having regard to the entire chain of happening in connection with the ratings strike, the question of discipline should not be viewed in narrow spirit. Nothing should be done, Maulana Azad said, to give the impression that individuals can be or are responsible for collective and general feelings and actions.

Maulana Azad said: Now that the R.I.N. episode has come to a close, it is possible to view its origin and development in their proper perspective in a dispassionate manner. It is, whether the action of ratings in going on strike is called by its technical term of the naval law, viz. "mutiny", or it is called by the civil term strike. The essential nature of the action resorted to by the ratings undergoes no change. It is perfectly clear that certain grievances which the ratings had been feeling for some time were not redressed for one reason or other.

Certain immediate incidents brought the trouble to a head, but the root of the struggle, as far as one can judge, was the feeling of the ratings that in spite of the fact that they were in no sense inferior to those of the British Navy, they were not placed on the same footing as regards general treatment, for a hundred and fifty years of subject to this discriminatory treatment. Now that India has come of age, and of national dignity and self-respect, racial discrimination is very keenly felt and resented.

It is quite obvious from the facts as they have been reported that Indian ratings of R.I.N. went on strike as the result of what they considered was a gratuitous insult to national self-respect. They formulated their demands in a clear and precise form. Examination of their demands shows that they were legitimate, and so far as they are legitimate, they must be sympathetically examined and redressed.

The term "Ring Leader" in such instances, said President Azad, usually applies to a person, who acts as a spokesman of general body of

complainants. It would be unjust to select such persons for punishment. In the present atmosphere of the country, nothing should be done which may accentuate the situation. I earnestly appeal to the authorities concerned who seem to be anxious to secure efficient working of the services both during the interim period and in the future to try to see things from the Indian national point of view. India is not in a mood to tolerate any action that may have even the semblance of the suppression of national spirit in any quarter.

Document No. 80

Advice dated 1-3-1946 to the Congress Legislators

“The changed conditions demand that in every province we should be ready to shoulder the responsibility of office,” said the President of the Indian National Congress, Maulana Azad, in an interview with the Associated Press of America on Wednesday.

The Congress President was dictating in flowing Urdu a condensed version of the 45-minute speech he made behind closed doors to 50 newly elected Congress members of the Punjab Assembly on Wednesday at their first meeting after the elections.

Maulana Azad told the Congress legislators, “After the last elections (1937) the Congress members decided that in the province where it is not in a majority group it should not share ministerial responsibility. But now the changed conditions demand that in every province we would be prepared to shoulder this responsibility.”

“Therefore this time in the Punjab,” he told them, your responsibilities have doubled. And there is all the greater need for you to stand solid and united to-day than ever before.”

The Congress President became retrospective and said, “In June, 1945, at the time of my release from jail, I had a mental picture of the future India. And whatever steps I have taken since then, I have taken keeping that picture in full view and every day I find that I am nearer to that picture.”

“I was in Karachi. I was in Shillong. But I have the same picture before me,” added Maulana Azad.

He said, “The picture that I am seeing now is a picture of success and glory. It is splendid picture.”

“And every day that passes raises my hopes,” he said. “I can’t go into details at present,” he added, “I can tell you this. I was never so hopeful about my country as now.”

The Congress President appealed to the legislators to sink their differences.

He told them, "I know there are differences amongst you but now, after the elections, you should not let these grow to the extent that they may retard progress and work of the organisation."

"In the past you have made many sacrifices. You must make one more. Forget your personal differences."

Document No. 81

Statement to the A.P.I. dated 4-3-1946

The Congress President, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, in a statement to the Associated Press of India at Lahore on March 2, 1946 defines the general attitude of the Congress on the question of tackling the food situation with the Viceroy and made certain suggestions which are under consideration."

The Congress President says: "In view of the tense political situation and acute scarcity of food which the country is threatened it is necessary that the general attitude of the Congress should be made known to all concerned beyond any doubt. India is passing through the birth pangs of freedom on the one hand, and the ordeal of many privations or threats of privations which always form part of the aftermath of the war on the other. The urge of freedom accentuated by the past five years of war has given a poignancy to the impatience of every section of the population of India. It is a phase of human longings all the world over which has brought with it a new mental climate. None who is concerned with the rapid advance man is making towards his destiny can ignore or gloss over it without peril. The Congress is essentially a political organisation based on the will and aspirations of the people. Its leadership has, as I have said before weathered many storms and has steered that bark of the country in close and wide contact with the people. We are fully alive to the urgency of the new spirit and to the impatience of the younger generation. But we are equally conscious of our heavy responsibilities at this critical time. The situation does not admit of over-simplified formulas of action. It is difficult and complex and demand the most careful and cautious handling. I must therefore appeal to all the parties in the country to exercise restraint and to allow the situation to be confined to manageable proportions.

Transfer of power from foreign to Indian hands and its assumption by the people who are the true repository of all powers and sovereignty is now only a matter of short time. It is therefore most essential that all should watch their steps and desist from creating situations which may lend themselves to exploitation by those who would prejudice the early realisation of India's aspirations.

“Much self control is imperatively demanded by circumstances of the day. Strikes, hartals, and defiance of the temporary authority of the day are out of place today. No immediate cause has arisen to join issue with the foreign rulers who are now acting as caretakers.”

In any case it is in abeyance until the refusal to transfer power and that not for a long time. When the time comes for entering the lists the Congress will not hesitate to sound the bugle call. In the meantime all energy must be reserved, all clashes should be scrupulously avoided.

On the food front which is India's immediate concern there should be willing co-operation between the temporary government of the day and the people. Strikes and demonstrations, hartals and processions should not be resorted to and the general atmosphere in the country should be allowed to remain calm and peaceful.

“Much serious work which demands all the mental energy of the leaders lies immediately ahead. All diversions at this stage will prove detrimental to the immediate tasks ahead. None not even the most unimaginative of our foreign rulers is in doubt of the potentialities and urgency of the situation and those who think that demonstrations are necessary to emphasise the impatience of the people, are wasting their and the people's energy. Again those who believe in skirmishes as invigorating tonic misjudge the actual needs of the situation.

I have discussed the food situation with the Viceroy and made certain suggestions which are under consideration. Alarmist rumours should be discouraged and popular committees of producers and consumers should spring up in rural areas, and dealers of foodstuffs and consumers in urban areas should set up similar committees to keep a vigilant eye on abuses which shortsighted greed dictates. The cut in rations should be regarded as a farsighted measure for saving millions of lives. There are hopeful signs of an improvement of the situation if only food is kept out of party politics.”

Document No. 82

Extracts from a Public Address dated 16-3-1946 in Bombay

Addressing a public meeting in Bombay on March 16, 1946, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad appealed to the citizens of Bombay and the people of India to maintain a calm and peaceful atmosphere in the country and strengthen the hands of the Congress for the forthcoming negotiations with the British Cabinet Mission.

Maulana Azad said that till the other day the country was confronted with many problems of equally urgent importance. All those problems had receded into the background because of the most important problem of the day, namely, how India should take over the reins of her destiny in her own hands. That was the problem not only of the Congress but of the Indian people as a whole.

While the Congress was doing its best to play its part in the present critical juncture of India's history, the people of India should also play their part. The Congress must have an army of enthusiastic, determined, strong but peaceful people.

"The Congress wants you to have faith in its leadership and wait for its call like disciplined soldiers of a disciplined army. If you act upto it, the Congress will be the strongest political party in the world, and no power on earth can prevent it from attaining the independent of the country in the shortest possible time."

He advised the people to conserve their energies. If they frittered away their strength, as they did recently in Bombay and other cities, they would prove great problem to the country. The lack of discipline and dissipation of their energies stand in the way of their achieving the freedom of the country.

He made it clear that whatever had happened in Bombay recently was all wrong. Even if it was done with patriotic motives, he would say that it was ill-conceived and certainly not in the interests of India.

Maulana Azad added that the Congress leaders were all ripe with experience. They had passed through all kinds of trials and tribulations. The Congress leaders know when to negotiate and when to strike. You

should all, therefore, wait for the Congress call, and the Congress leaders know when to give that call. The people should not become impatient and try to give directions to the leaders.

“Now the British Cabinet Mission is coming to our country. The Congress wants at this time there should be a peaceful atmosphere in the country so that the negotiations can be carried on peacefully. If we succeed in our talks with the Cabinet Mission, a new chapter in India’s history begins. If we fail the Congress will give the call for a final struggle for our independence.”

Document No. 83

Interview to the A.T.P. dated 18-3-1946

The Congress President Maulana Abul Kalam Azad in an interview to Associated Press of India on March 18, at New Delhi declared that he saw no reason why a solution of the Indian problem should not be considered hopeful.

In view of the forthcoming talks and negotiations with the British Cabinet Mission the Congress President said that he would not attempt to speculate about things or anticipated the course of events. "In so far as the Congress is concerned, the Maulana said, "Our fundamentals and the main outline of our approach are already well-known. As regards details, it is obvious it all depends on developments on various adjustments which will have to be made."

The Maulana spoke with quiet confidence of the coming negotiations. In a message to the British public he said: "I find in the latest pronouncement of Mr. Attlee a new spirit and if the Mina is coming out with a determination to find a solution in that spirit I see no reason why the outcome should not be considered hopeful.

Speaking of India in the international context Maulana Azad said: "History does not record any example of transition of power from one hand to another in a peaceful manner but the world has developed a new consciousness — at any rate let us hope so — and people are wide awake and conscious of their rights and the time has arrived when such transition should be the rule and not the exception. Apart from internal developments here is a higher aspect of the question of India's independence which has a significance in the present context of world events.

Whatever has taken place in the world during the past few years has brought about a new situation and a new chapter of human history is being written. We stand on the threshold of a new age. Events in world history and the high tension all round have brought about a situation in which India has acquired a strategic position which is absolutely focal."

"Events that occur in the neighbourhood of India are bound to have

repurcussions straightway in India and we know where a great tension exists. It is next door to India. And independent India to-day would be a great guarantee of peace throughout the world and will stem the tide of ambitions all round. This is a great point of absolute urgency which demands that India's settlement should be lifted local out local and internal conditions and placed on the basis of the world's demand for peace and therefore the strengthening of India's defence by Indians themselves. It is in the light of these events that I am hopeful of a settlement which should be satisfactory to India, to Britain and the world.

The Congress President emphatically denied Mr. Jinnah's assertion that the Congress created obstacles in the way of the League forming Ministries or that they ignored the Muslim League in provincial assemblies where Congress had an absolute majority. "I regret," Maulana Azad said "that the actual facts of the situation have not be correctly assessed in fact a wrong interpretation is put on the actual approach which the Congress has made in regard to formation of Ministries.

"In Sind although the strenght of the League Party was 29, a clear offer was made that there should be an all-party Ministry with four Ministers each from the League and the Coalition Party respectively. But this offer was turned down. Again in Assam where the Congress had absolute majority of 62 in a House of 108 and therefore did not depend on any "outside" help for the stability of the Ministry, the Congress offered to take two Ministers from the League Party on the basis of a Coalition.

"This offer too" the Congress President said, "was turned down. The Congress has even now kept two places reserved which were originally reserved for the League."

"In the Punjab a responsible leader of the Muslim League Party suggested the following formula for a coalition Ministry: "The Congress and League Parties in the Punjab agree to form a Coalition Party on the basis of equal representation in the Cabinet and each party to nominate in the Cabinet its choice. The question of Pakistan will be left to be decided by the respective All-India High Commands of the two Parties, and will let be raised in the Punjab Legislative Assembly by either of us while the Coalition lasts."

"I have my consent to this document even without changing a comma" the Maulana Saheb said. "To the best of my information and belief," he said. "All responsible leaders of the Punjab Provincial Muslim League had agreed to this formula and were keen on its being accepted by us. But when the question was referred to Mr. Jinnah who

was then in Shillong, it is said, that he rejected the formula except under one condition, namely, that no Muslim would be included in the quota reserved for the Congress Party."

"On the basis of the formula the proposal was that there should be five Ministers each from the Congress and the League Party respectively. Mr. Jinnah contended that the Congress must give an undertaking that no Muslim should be included in its quota. I was not prepared to agree to this dictation. Further it was totally inconsistent with the formula suggested by the responsible and prominent Muslim League leaders namely that each party had the right to nominate in the Cabinet any member it chose."

Therefore the choice lay between either Section 93 coming into operation or forming a coalition with the Unionist Party, which in fact was done. It is perfectly obvious that the entire responsibility for keeping out of the Ministry in the Punjab lies at the door of the League.

"It is notable", the Congress President said, "that although the convention in the Punjab has so far has been that Muslims and non-Muslims in the Cabinet have been equal in number, according to the above formula if the Congress had been left free to offer a Muslim to the Cabinet, the Muslim majority province would also have had a majority of Muslims in the Cabinet.

"Obviously the door is open everywhere and even now if the League is prepared to work out the formula in its spirit, I believe that Malik Khizr Hyat Khan Tiwana, the Leader of the Unionist Party, will prefer not to stand in the way."

Maulana Azad is leaving for Calcutta on 19th March morning.

Document No. 84

Press interview about the meet with Governor of N.W.F.P. dated 6-4-1946

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Congress President, in a statement issued before his departure for Calcutta says:

"I have seen the Governor of the N.W.F.P., Sir George Cunningham's statement in the press in which he has said that throughout his long period of governorship he has maintained the strictest impartiality, and that the suggestion that he has interfered in the course of elections in favour of the Muslim League is incorrect. Further, he has characterised the story that he as Governor had asked the Nawab of Hoti during a marriage ceremony at Hoti Mardan to join the Muslim League as a canard. The complaints which he has disposed of in a valedictory statement before leaving India should have been appropriately dealt with while he was still in the province concerned to enable those on whose testimony they were ventilated to substantiate them. Have no personal bias or animus against the Governor and the information which was supplied to me had come from what I regard as an unimpeachable source. This information had come to me through the present Chief Minister of the N.W.F.P., and I had no reason to doubt its accuracy."

Document No. 85

On League urge for Partition dated 15-4-1946

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad made the following the statement on Monday, April 15, 1946:

I have considered from every possible point of view the scheme of Pakistan as formulated by the Muslim League. As an Indian I have examined its implications for the future of India as a whole. As a Muslim I have examined its likely effects upon the fortunes of Muslims of India.

Considering the scheme in all its aspects I have come to the conclusion that it is harmful not only for India as a whole but for Muslims in particular. And in fact it creates more problems than it solves.

I must confess that the very term Pakistan goes against my grain. It suggests that some portions of it are pure while others are impure. Such a division of territories into pure and impure is un-Islamic and is more in keeping with orthodox brahmanism which divides men and countries into holy and unholy—a division which is a repudiation of the very spirit of Islam. Islam recognises no such division and the Prophet says, God has made the whole world a mosque for me.”

Further, it seems that the scheme of Pakistan is a symbol of defeatism and has been built up on the analogy of the Jewish demands for a national home. It is a confession that Indian Muslims cannot hold their own in India as a whole and would be content to withdraw to a corner specially reserved for them.

One can sympathize with the aspiration of the Jews for such a national home, as they are scattered all over the world and cannot in any region have any effective voice in the administration.

The conditions of Indian Muslims is quite otherwise. Over 90 millions in number they are in quantity and quality a sufficiently important element in Indian life to influence decisively all questions of administration and policy. Nature has further helped them by concentrating them in certain areas.

In such context, the demand for Pakistan loses all force, as a Muslim, I for one not prepared for a moment to give up my right to treat the whole of India as my dominated to share in the shaping of its political and

economic life. To me it seems a sure sign of cowardice to give up what is my patrimony and content myself with a mere fragment of it.

As is well known, Mr. Jinnah's Pakistan scheme is based on his two-nation theory. His thesis is that India contains many nationalities based on religious differences. Of them the two major nations, the Hindus and Muslims, must as separate nations have separate states. When Dr. Edward Thompson once pointed out to Mr. Jinnah that Hindus and Muslims live side by side in thousands of Indian towns, villages and hamlets, Mr. Jinnah replied that this in no way affected their separate nationality. Two nations according to Mr. Jinnah confront one another in every hamlet, village and town, and he, therefore, desires that they should be separated into two states.

I am prepared to overlook all other aspects of the problem and judge it from the point of view of Muslim interests alone. I shall go still further and say that if it can be shown that the scheme of Pakistan can in any way benefit Muslims I would be prepared to accept it myself and also to work for its acceptance by others. But the truth is that even if I examine the scheme from the point of view of the communal interests of the Muslims themselves, I am forced to the conclusion that it can in no way benefit them or allay their legitimate fears.

Let us consider dispassionately the consequences which will follow if we give effect to the Pakistan scheme. India will be divided into two states. One with a majority of Muslims and the other of Hindus. In the Hindustan State there will remain $3\frac{1}{2}$ crores of Muslims scattered in in small minorities all over the land. With 17 per cent. in U.P., 12 per cent. in Bihar and 9 per cent. in Madras, they will be weaker than they are today in the Hindu majority provinces. They have had their homelands in these regions for almost a thousand years and built up well-known centres of Muslim culture and civilization there.

They will awaken overnight and discover that they have become alien and foreigners. Backward industrially, educationally and economically, they will be left to the mercies to what would become an unadulterated Hindu raj.

On the other hand, their position within the Pakistan State will be vulnerable and weak. Nowhere in Pakistan will their majority be comparable to the Hindu majority in the Hindustan States.

In fact, their majority will be so slight that it will be offset by the economical, educational and political lead enjoyed by non-Muslims in these areas. Even if this were not so and Pakistan were overwhelmingly Muslim in population, it still could hardly solve the problem of Muslim in Hindustan.

Document No. 86

Interview to A.P.I. dated 16-4-1946

At the end of this morning meeting of the Congress Working Committee, the Congress President Maulana Abul Kalam Azad indicated that the Congress position remains unchanged.

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Congress President, summed up the Congress position as it emerges from four days' discussion by the Working Committee in Delhi. He stated the position emphatically in an exclusive interview to A.P.I.

Answering the question about the latest Congress position the Maulana stated: "The Congress stands for four fundamental things:

First, complete independence; Second, United India; Third, one federation composed of fully autonomous units which will have residuary powers in their hands and; Fourth, two lists of central subjects, one compulsory and the other optional.

Asked how the Congress proposed to allay Muslim fears, the Maulana said: "The position to which I have now brought the Congress ought to meet all legitimate Muslim fears. I believe that the Congress formula is free from the defects inherent in the League demand for Pakistan. Under the Congress formula, Muslims will not be the aliens in the Muslim minority provinces which they will be under the Pakistan scheme. Under the Congress formula, again, the Muslim fear of Hindu domination is removed by the fact that the Centre will have a minimum list of subjects under its control."

Q. Supposing the points favourable to the League are taken out of the Congress formula and adopted by the Cabinet Mission and worked into a scheme from which the defects of Pakistan are not excluded, what will happen?

The Congress President: "The Congress will never agree to it."

Q. Is it not a fact that a majority of Muslims in India are behind the Muslim League demand for Pakistan?

The Maulana declared with emphasis: "I do not accept the position

that a majority of Muslims favour the League demand for Pakistan. I will not accept it until a plebiscite is taken to establish it.

If Muslims are made to understand the full meaning of the Congress formula in an atmosphere free from emotionalism, I am certain in my mind that they will recognise that the Congress offer gives them something which is definitely better than Pakistan can give them."

Document No. 87

On Indian freedom dated 16-4-1946

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the Muslim President of the National Congress told the New Delhi correspondent of 'Reynold's News':

"My vision of a free India is of a Socialist India. I want to see the millions of workers and peasants of my country get a square meal and a square deal as a matter of right."

Another comment he made was: I agree with Ernest Bevin that the old concept of State sovereignty will have to be given up in time and that the Sovereign Powers of the Individual States must be merged in a world authority."

Of future Indian-British relations, Azad is reported as saying: "The future relations of our two countries are to be regulated by a Treaty and I have no doubt that the terms of the Treaty will be acceptable and mutually beneficial to both India and Britain. The Treaty will be signed by two independent and equal partners."

He added that the question of India remaining in the British Commonwealth was primarily a question for the constitution-making body, but said that if the Indian-British negotiations were settled satisfactorily, "India will have more friendly relations with the British than with any other peoples."

The New Delhi correspondent of the 'Sunday Chronicle' reports that Congress has a secret new plan for independent India, which has been approved by the Working Committee and which Azad, as the President of the Committee, will lay before the British Cabinet Mission on April 17th, 1946.

Document No. 88

On Congress President's election dated 26-4-1946

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is the most likely next Congress President. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad who has held this office for six years now – the longest period for any individual to be Congress President – in a statement to-day declared that under the present circumstances, Pandit Nehru is the best choice. He added that his colleagues in the Working Committee shared his view.

Maulana Azad says: "Now that election of Congress delegates from different provinces is over and the time has come for the choice of President for next year, I consider it my duty to place my views on the question before the public. Ever since I came out of jail, there have been suggestions from various quarters that I should continue as President for another year. I have tried to discourage such moves for reasons which I shall now place before the public. I have borne the responsibilities of Congress President for over six years continuously, a period that was unprecedented in the history of the Congress. Circumstances were such that this was inevitable, and I have tried to discharge my duties and serve my country to the best of my ability. Now, however, I must ask to be excused. After considering all aspects of the question it is my belief that the person best suited to carry out these duties in the changed circumstances is Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. This is my personal opinion. I am glad to find from informal discussions with friends and colleagues that they share my opinion. The choice, however, is with the delegates and they are free to exercise their right as they will."

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has been thrice President of the Congress – in Lahore (1929-1930) when Congress passed the independence resolution, Lucknow (1934-1935) and Faizpur (1935-1936) and when the first village session of the Congress was held.

Document No. 89

On the Cabinet Mission dated 26-6-1946

The Congress President Maulana Abul Kalam Azad in a 1000-word review of the last three month's negotiations with the Cabinet Mission says:

"In our prolonged negotiations with the Cabinet Delegation and the Viceroy, my colleagues and I have throughout been guided by one governing principle. It was the achievement of Indian independence and the solution of all outstanding problems my methods of peaceful negotiations.

"Such methods have both their advantage and their limitations. Independence achieved through violence and conflict may be more spectacular but entails endless suffering and bloodshed and leaves behind a heritage of bitterness and hatred.

"Peaceful methods leave no bitter trail but neither are the results so spectacular as in a violent revolution. The present negotiations have therefore to be judged from his standard. Keeping in mind the method chosen and the peculiar nature of our problems, dispassionate observers will be forced to admit that though all our hopes have not been fulfilled, the results marks a decisive step forward towards the attainment of our goal. After searching discussion and analysis this was the conclusion reached by the Congress Working Committee, and they have accordingly accepted the long-term proposals.

"As I have explained in my statement of the 14th April 1946, the Congress scheme for the isolation of India's political and constitutional problem rested upon two fundamental bases."

The Congress held that in the peculiar circumstances of India, a limited but organic and powerful centre confined to certain basic subjects was inevitable. A unitary Government could no more meet the requirements of the case than a division of India into several independent states.

"A second fundamental principle was the recognition of the complete autonomy of the provinces with all residuary powers vested in them.

Congress held that the provinces would administer all excepting the basic central subjects. From the nature of the case, it would be open to the provinces to delegate to the Centre such other subjects as they chose.

"It is an open secret that the Cabinet Mission's long-term proposals are framed according to the principles laid down in the Congress scheme.

A question about the implication of provincial autonomy was raised during the recent Simla Conference. It was asked that if the provinces were fully autonomous, did not two or more of them have the right, if they chose of setting up inter-provincial machinery for administering such subjects as they were allocated to it?

"The declared views of the Congress on the question of provincial autonomy did not permit a denial of the force in the contention. My correspondence during the Simla Conference has already been selected and given to the public a clear exposition of the Congress views on the question.

"The only novel feature in the Cabinet Mission's scheme is the idea of grouping the provinces into three different sections. As soon as the Constituent Assembly meets, it will, according to the proposals of the Cabinet Mission, divide itself into three Committees. Each Committee will be composed of members from provinces in the appropriate section and will together decide whether to form a group or not. Section 15 of the Cabinet Mission proposals have clearly recognised the rights of provinces to form groups or not. The Cabinet Mission intend that the provinces should exercise this right at a particular stage.

"The Congress Working Committee hold that whatever the intention of the Cabinet Mission, (the statement) of 16th May does not bear such interpretation. They hold that the provinces are fully autonomous and have the right to decide the question at any stage they like. Section 15 and the general spirit of the proposals support the Congress interpretation.

"The provinces have the right to decide either at the very beginning before the group constitution has been framed at all or at the end after they have examined the group constitution as it has emerged from the Committee of the Constituent Assembly. I am convinced that the Congress interpretation cannot be challenged."

"If a province decides to remain outside the Group from the very beginning, it cannot be compelled to come in.

"There is the problem of Europeans in Assam and Bengal. The Cabinet Mission's proposals have done away with weightage of

representation and have clearly laid down that there is to be one representative for every million of the population. This automatically rules the Europeans out of the picture."

Once the weightage is discarded they have no right to any representation at all on the basis of population. It is the interest of Europeans themselves to refrain from seeking election or participating in the voting. I am confident that the Europeans in Bengal and Assam will act with wisdom and statesmanship. Since the Europeans in Bengal have already decided to refrain from participating on the elections to the Constituent Assembly, I trust that the Europeans in Assam will follow their example.

"It must, however, be admitted that one grave flaw in this picture is the delay in the formation of a provisional Government. Such provisional Govt. alone can provide the atmosphere in which the Constituent Assembly can function with a sense of full freedom and authority. Their mutual interactions are so intimate that each would suffer in the absence of the other. Earnestly hope that this lacuna in the settlement will be filled and a representative and powerful Provisional Government soon set up.

In assessing the results of the negotiations we must not forget that the two main objective of the Congress have been the freedom and the unity of India. The Congress stand has been vindicated on both these points. The constitution-making body will be a purely Indian Assembly elected by Indian votes alone.

It will have the unfettered right to shape India's future Constitution and decide our relations with the British Commonwealth and the rest of the world and this sovereign Constituent Assembly will legislate not for a divided but for a united India. All schemes of partition of India have been rejected once and for all. The Union Centre may be limited, but it will be powerful and organic and will integrate into one harmonious whole the many provincial, linguistic and cultural diversities which characterise contemporary India."

Document No. 90

Maulana Azad on W.C.R. of 7-7-1946

The way discussion on the Working Committee's Resolution has been going on in the country makes me feel that the people seem to have forgotten the question that the Working Committee was faced with. The Committee had either to accept or reject certain proposals placed before it. It had to be guided by what the Congress had been demanding all these years. The Congress had demanded that India must have the right to chalk out her own future and frame her own Constitution. For many years the British Government were not prepared to accept this demand of the Congress to allow Indians to frame their own Constitution. But circumstances had now forced the British Government to agree to India's fundamental demand of summoning of Constituent Assembly for the purpose of framing a constitution for a free and independence India."

"The Cabinet Mission's proposal contained in the State paper issued on May 16, gave us this right to summon a Constituent Assembly to frame our own Constitution. This is what we have been demanding all these years. What will be our position, if we refuse that offer. If we refused the Offer, then there would be no meaning to one to our demand. The things that we have been demanding for years have been accepted the offer so long as the Committee felt convinced that it would lead the country the end the Congress had before it."

"The plan envisaged by the Cabinet Mission in their White Paper of May 16 consists of two aspects—political and communal. As far as political and communalism implications of the proposals are concerned, the proposals make it clear that the Constituent Assembly will have the fullest right to frame a constitution for a free and independent India and such a British Government. We have been given the freedom to decide whether we wish to remain within the British Empire or be completely independent. It is for us to decide this vital question and the British Government does not wish to dictate to us in this respect as they have hitherto been doing."

"In my first interview with the Cabinet Mission I made it absolutely clear to the Delegation that the Constituent Assembly we wished to

summon should have unfettered freedom to frame a constitution for a free and independent India. The British Government has accepted this demand and has made it clear that the freedom of India is not under question and it has been granted without any question. Why then should raise doubts in the face of such unequivocal declaration by the British Government?

"The Cabinet Mission's Proposal also have once and for all times cleared all doubts about the question of the division of India. These proposals have made it clear beyond a shadow of doubt that India shall remain undivided a single unit with a strong Central Government composed of federal units."

"Our main demands having this been accepted by the Cabinet Delegation, you will agree the Working Committee had to accept the proposals after pointing out the defects in them. This is what the Working Committee has done by its resolution of June 26. My answer to those critics who say that we should not have accepted this proposal is that if we rejected this proposal now, it may not be possible at a later date in the future to secure proposal acceptable to us."

"For some time now the Congress had been convinced that a completely unitary form of Central Government was unsuited for India as it is impracticable. The Congress had also felt convinced that a division of India as demanded by the Muslim League would prove disastrous to the country. The Congress, had, therefore decided to pursue a middle course. That is the reason why the Congress recommended a federal form of centre with maximum autonomy to the federating units including Residuary Powers. This help to keep India undivided, at the same time ensuring utmost autonomy to the units to develop themselves individually and freely to the maximum extent."

"We placed this proposal before the Cabinet Mission which accepted this proposal in principle and produced with a united centre limited powers such as controlling Defence, Foreign Affairs, Communications and Finance to the extent needed to maintain the stability of the Union Centre. The Constituent Assembly could now find ways and means of strengthening the Union Centre by conceding to the Centre sufficient powers to levy enough finances to support itself and maintain an efficient defence force to protect the country from external aggression and internal turmoil."

"The only new feature of the Cabinet Mission's proposal to which the Congress had not agreed fully was the one relating to grouping. The

Working Committee has therefore made it clear that there should be no compulsion in the matter of grouping. The provinces should be free to decide whether they wish to join a particular group or not. We are confident that the interpretation we have put on the grouping clause is the interpretation."

"The Congress Working Committee has made it clear that it cannot agree to the Europeans of Bengal and Assam participating in the framing of the constitution either by being members of the Constituent Assembly or participating in the elections to the Constituent Assembly by voting. If the Europeans eventually decide to exercise their so-called right of voting in the elections, to the Constituent Assembly, then the Congress will have to reconsider its decision."

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad in conclusion welcomed the decision of the Bengal European not to exercise their right of vote and hoped that Assam Europeans also would do likewise.

Document No. 91

On Nehru's Speech dated 7-7-1946

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the Congress President in his valedictory speech said, "We have met here after six years. No elections to the All-India Congress Committee could be held till now owing to the War and the abnormal conditions created by the war. These six years have been years of profound importance in our history as they mark far-reaching changes in the international situation and our own struggle for our national independence. We are on the threshold of our freedom. Our freedom is coming not because of international changes but because of the revolution that has taken place in our own country resulting in great national awakening."

"The new-All-India Congress Committee which has just assembled contains new blood and fresh minds. I am glad to welcome the new members as new blood always gives fresh vigour and strength. This meeting of the new All-India Congress Committee should have been held alongwith the plenary session of the Congress, but owing to abnormal conditions we have been unable to hold the annual session. Now that a new All India Congress Committee has been elected I have decided to hand over the reins of office of the Congress President to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to allow the work of the Congress to be carried on uninterrupted, though the annual session itself may not be held for some time.

When I took charge of the office of the Congress six years ago, we were struggling for our freedom. But today when I lay down the reins of the office, I am happy to find that the question is no longer one of fighting for our freedom, as we are already on the threshold of freedom, but of working out the freedom that is coming. Only one further step is required for us to reach our goal."

Reply to Criticism

The Congress President then referred to the criticism that the Working Committee had not consulted the All-India Congress Committee earlier in connection with the constitutional negotiations and said that the criticism was wrong for the reason that as soon as definite conclusions

were reached the Working Committee lost no time in summoning the All-India Congress Committee to get its stamp of approval on the decisions taken by the Working Committee.

Maulana Azad urged the Committee to consider the results of the Working Committee's negotiations with the British Cabinet Mission dispassionately and see if the Working Committee had not discharged its responsibilities in the best interests of the country.

The Congress President then announced that he would now vacate the chair and asked Pandit Nehru to occupy the chair. The two Presidents then warmly shook hands and Pandit Nehru took the chair.

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel then in a brief speech paid a warm and glowing tribute to the arduous work done by the Congress President Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. He said, "This is the first time in the history of the Congress that any one person has held the reins of office of the Congress President continuously for six years. This honour goes to Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. During these six years, whatever difficulties the Congress has to face and there were many difficulties in the way of the Congress were faced under the able and inspiring leadership of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad.

After we passed the 'Quit India' resolution in Aug. 1942, we were together for these years in the Ahmednagar Fort. Later after our release we were together at Simla for some weeks and again for three months recently during the present negotiations. I have watched Maulana Abul Kalam Azad during all these period to work both day and night. There has not been a single occasion in these six years of great stress and strain, when Maulana Abul Kalam Azad failed to maintain the dignity and honour of the high office he held. He never allowed the honour of the Congress to be sullied. Anyone else in his position might not have been able to show the courage and determination with which he bore the responsibilities of this great office for six long years.

The credit for bringing us to the present position in our struggle for our independence goes entirely to Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. We asked the British to quit India in 1942. They have told us that they are ready to quit. We are now discussing the ways and means of their quitting and how to make their quitting smooth and easy. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad deserves all praise for this great achievement."

Pandit Gobind Vallabh Pant speaking next paid a glowing tribute to Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. He said that Maulana Abul Kalam Azad had piloted the Congress with great dignity, honour and astuteness. The six

years of his presidentship were years of great events. "We had first the individual civil disobedience movement. Then came the Cripps Mission during which Maulana Saheb showed great statemanship in his negotiations with Sir Stafford Cripps. Closely following the failure of the Cripps Mission the Congress, under the leadership of Maulana Azad despite domestic worries and failing health led the 1942 struggle and brought the country on the threshold of freedom. His leadership has contributed greatly to our present position. I pray for his long life and hope that he will soon see India free."

The new President, Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, speaking next recalled the storm on the day of the Ramgarh Congress session and compared the past six years of Maulana Saheb's presidentship to a storm. He said that "these years were most momentous in the history of the Congress and India as these were years of a great revolution in the country. Who is there amongst us who can follow in his footsteps and carry the burden with the same ability and courage as he did? As far myself, I was for a long time unable to make up my mind whether to accept the responsibility of Presidentship now or not. But the day before yesterday I persuaded myself to shoulder the responsibility on the advice of Mahatma Gandhi and also my colleagues on the Working Committee."

Document No. 92

On Delhi Resolution dated 7-7-1946

Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad dealt with the various criticisms made against the Delhi resolution by those who opposed the resolution (Bombay July 7, 1946) said that many of the opposition speakers had stated that the British Government were responsible for sponsoring the Constituent Assembly. This was utterly wrong. "No one can say", declared the Maulana, "that the British Government sent the Cabinet Mission to India to offer us the Constituent Assembly as a free gift. We have secured the Constituent Assembly as a result of our struggle and sacrifices during the past fifty years. The final struggle that was launched by Mahatma Gandhi in 1942 did, of course, hasten the pace of our freedom movement.

"The British people and their Labour Government have realised that we the people of India are determined, have freedom and nothing on earth can prevent us from achieving our goal. The British Govt. should transfer power peacefully and quit or allow us to take it forcefully and they have chosen the wiser course.

"I am unable to agree with those who say that by going into the Constituent Assembly we shall be weakening the Congress organisation. Why should anyone think that by going into the Constituent Assembly we shall weaken ourselves. Whatever difficulties may stand in our way we will overcome them as we are determined to reach our final goal.

Discard Fear Complex

"Opposition speakers have exhibited a fear complex vague fear of the unknown. I ask if there is any problem which has no difficulties inherent in it. It is no use approaching any problem with a fear complex. If we do this we shall not be able to achieve anything at all.

"In the proposed Constituent Assembly the Congress will have a definite majority and in spite of this we have fears as to how we are going to settle the fate of the country. We have won our struggle for freedom through sheer sacrifices and suffering and I will ask you not to fatter and fritter away the fruits of victory by adopting a gloomy outlook and fear complex.

Statesmanship demands that we should be practical in our approach

to problems. We must utilise opportunities as they present themselves to further our own ends. Sometimes circumstances may be such that we may have to decide on a struggle. At other times it may be that the door to our goal may be opened through negotiations and in such a situation it is our duty to enter into negotiations and enter through the doorway that is open."

"The Congress has never departed from its fundamental principle or direct action. We have always sworn by it. We made it clear to the British Govt. even before the Cabinet Mission was sent to India that they should either give us our freedom or face a struggle. We were then told that we were indulging in threats. We made it clear that it was wrong of the British Govt. to regard it as mere threat. Against this background we started the Delhi negotiations.

"It has been argued that the Central Government will not be a strong one unless it has within its fold economic relations and finance. These questions will be settled by the Constituent Assembly. I do agree that the Central Govt. can never be effective unless it has the means to support itself. The Congress will never tolerate a weak Centre."

Not A Trap

I want to make it clear that those who say that the Constituent Assembly is a trap are making a great mistake. There is no question of the Constituent Assembly being a trap. We asked for a Constituent Assembly to frame a Constitution for a free and independent India and the Cabinet Mission agreed to our demand. How then can anyone call it a trap?

I want to emphasise that by accepting the Constituent Assembly proposal we shall lay at rest one of the longest standing communal problems. The Muslim League has been demanding all these years the division of India into Hindustan and Pakistan and two separate Constituent Assemblies to draw up separate constitution. Both these things have been abandoned by the Muslim League by its acceptance of the Cabinet Mission proposals of May 16. The result of this proposal is that there shall be one united India and one Constituent Assembly with one Central Govt.

I ask if this is not a great achievement. If you reject the Constituent Assembly as the opposition wants you to do, I ask if we shall not be adding to our problems and quarrels. Victory has come into our hands and please do not turn it into a defeat (cheers). The door to the Constituent Assembly is open to enable us to draw up our own constitution. Please enter it and complete our task of framing our own constitution.

Document No. 93

Message dated 11-7-1946 to W.S.C.

The World Student Conference is meeting today in the midst of ruin, desolation and death to proclaim the victory of new life. The choice of Prague as the venue is itself symbolic. Two armageddons in the course of 25 years have taught us that the world will not know freedom so long as a single nation is unfree. Like peace, freedom is also indivisible, and democracy alone can be the basis of that freedom. Youngmen who are meeting today must build for a new world where colour, creed or race will not divide men. I am glad that the All-India Student Congress are sending a Delegation to this Conference and I wish them every success.

Document No. 94

Statement dated 22-8-1946 to the U.P.I.

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad interviewed by the United Press of India about the Congress offer to the League said, "In spite of the acceptance of the long-term plan of the Cabinet by the Congress, the Muslim League Council was swayed by apprehension and doubts. To remove its apprehensions and leave no room for doubt, the Congress Working Committee in its Wardha session reiterated its acceptance and clarified its position. All impartial observers agree that the Congress attitude is so clear, conciliatory and reasonable that no party can hereafter have any excuse for misunderstanding. In the meantime, after the League's rejection of the long as well as the short-term, the Viceroy invited the Congress, as in terms of the Cabinet Mission's proposals he was bound to, to form an interim government.

"It is well-known that the Congress rejected the short-term plan as the invitation to it was hedged with conditions the Congress could not accept; but the new invitation by the Viceroy was unconditional and the Congress was free to make any proposals it liked. In its attempt to conciliate the League and other minorities the Congress has, however, refrained from such as course and is prepared to form a government on the same basis as before namely a Cabinet of 14 with 6 representatives of the Congress, 5 of the League and 3 of the other minorities. The League had definitely accepted this structure of the Cabinet and in fact insisted on it even after the Congress rejection of it was known. Thus the Congress is making to the League an offer which the League had accepted from the British. The only difference is that now the Cabinet will be formed not by the British but by the Congress and the League. Unfortunately, Mr. Jinnah has refused to respond to the Congress appeal for co-operation.

Times are critical and momentous and nothing should be done in haste or anger. Now that the British has agreed to let the Indians settled their questions without interference by them, the responsibility of the League is greater as to whether they will accept or reject the hand of friendship and co-operation extended by Congress. I would again appeal to all leaders of the League to survey the situation passionately and come to a decision which will be a benefit to the country and the community alike.

Document No. 95

Statement to the Press on 27-2-1947

"The form in which my speech at the Conference of the Committee of Arabic and Persian Studies in Lucknow has been reported is likely to cause misunderstanding. The reports say that I had stated that the medium of instruction should be the mother tongue and that knowledge of English was necessary only to the extent of being able to read and write the language. My remarks were confined to Arabic students and in that context I had said that students should acquire at least a working knowledge in English. So far as general studies are concerned, it was never my intention to suggest that there should be any falling in the standard of English taught.

150 years of intimate contact has made English an integral part of our educational system and this cannot be changed without injury to the cause of one of the major languages of the world and Indians can neglect its study only at the risk of loss to themselves, I am convinced that in the future as well, the standard of teaching English should be maintained at as high a level as possible but the medium of instruction must from the very nature of the cause, be the mother tongue.

Document No. 96

Extracts from the Inaugural address dated 22-5-1947 at the session of the Standing Committee of the Legislature on education held in Shimla

The Interim Government should have given their highest priority to problem of education but political situation in the country had not been easy and most of them had been preoccupied with constant changes in the political scene. He felt that he had not been able to do all that he wanted though he had certain definite schemes and all that was necessary was to put them into execution.

Things are however coming to a head and we are all hoping that in a few weeks time the political problem will be decided finally. We can then apply our undivided attention and energy to the fulfilment of our educational plans. The most important task before the National Government is to set up a new programme of National Education. Although we have not achieved all that we wanted a new spirit is already in evidence.

Education is a provincial subject. Provinces will therefore, carry the actual work but it is the task of the Centre to set a standard for national education, I do not for a moment suggest any encroachment on provincial autonomy but if we are to get the most desirable results it is necessary that there should be one common pattern and here the Centre is of very great importance.

Whatever may be the decision in the political field it is therefore necessary that this department should continue for some time to come. In this way alone would it be possible for the provinces to work together in cooperation, coordinate all necessary measures and avoid duplication.

They need not discuss the omissions and commissions of the system of education obtaining for the last 150 years. Now the whole outlook was changing, new responsibilities and new demands had come and old standards must give place to new.

Now independence is within our grasp. The problem to-day is not so much as conquest of power as its proper use.

Document No. 97

Azad and the All-India Congress Committee

New Delhi, May 5 & 6, 1951

The All-India Congress Committee met on Saturday, the 5th May 1951 at 2 P.M. in the Constitution Club, New Delhi. Shri Purushottamdas Tandon presided. 227 members were present.

The proceedings began with the singing of Bande Mataram. The Congress President made his opening remarks in Hindi.

1. Printed copies of the audited accounts of the AICC for the period from 1st October 1949 to 30th September 1950 were distributed and the accounts were placed before the Committee by the Treasurer for adoption. Shri Kala Venkata Rao seconded the proposition.

The accounts were adopted unanimously.

2. The Congress President called for nominations for election to the Central Election Committee and fixed 5 P.M. as the time. Shri S.K. Patil proposed the following five persons to be the members of the Election Committee. Seth Govind Das seconded the proposal :

Dr. B.C. Roy
Shri Kamaraj Nadar
Shri Morarji Desai
Shri Govind Ballabh Pant
Shri S. Nijalingappa

The following names were also proposed:

Shri K. Hanumanthaiyya; Acharya J.B. Kripalani, Shri Mahabir Singh, Gyani Gurumukh Singh Musafir, Shri Jaya Narayan Vyas, Shri Brish Bhan, Shri Ram Sahay, Shri Brijlal Biyani, Shri S.K. Patil, Shri Anugraha Narayan Sinha, Shri Hare Krishna Mahtab, Seth Gobind Das, and Dr. B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya.

Except for the first seven, those proposed withdrew their names.

Maulana Azad said that some private talks regarding unity were still going on and suggested that the time for receiving nominations might, therefore, be extended to 10 P.M. on the next day.

The Congress President said that he agreed with the suggestion of Maulana Azad and as such had fixed 10 A.M. on the following day as the last hour of receiving nominations. He declared that the nominations could be given to one of the Secretaries.

After this the Congress President requested Shri Govind Ballabh Pant to move the resolution on Kashmir. He also added that certain changes have been made in the draft prepared by the Working Committee and distributed. By changing the words, no change was made in the substance of the resolution. The change in the draft was made in consultation with the members of the Working Committee. Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant then moved the following resolution on Kashmir.

KASHMIR

The All-India Congress Committee is of opinion that the last resolution of the Security Council of the UNO on the Kashmir issue is unacceptable to the people of India and endorses the action of the Government of India in rejecting it.

Shri Hifzur Rahman seconded the resolution.

Shri Mahabir Singh, Shri Algurai Shastri and Shri Shatrughan Saran Sinha moved amendments. Shri Vaidehi Charan Parashar wanted to know from the Congress President whether similar amendments could be moved by two persons. The Congress President said that there was a lot of difference between the wordings of the two amendments and as such both the amendments could be moved.

After Shri Algurai Shastri had moved his amendment, the Congress President told Shri Shatrughan Saran Sinha that his amendment was on the same subject as that of Shri Algurai Shastri and therefore he need not move his amendment but that he would be given an opportunity to speak.

Shri Shatrughan Saran Sinha pointed out that there was a difference in substance between his amendment and that of Shri Algurai Shastri and as such wanted permission to move his amendment. The Congress President agreed.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant replied to the debate and requested the movers of the amendments to withdraw their amendments. All the three amendments were withdrawn by leave of the House.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

3. The Congress President said that he would take up the non-official resolutions. Capt. Awadesh Pratap Singh said that he did not

find his resolution in the list of non-official resolutions circulated. The Congress President replied that his resolution was out of order. On this Capt. Awadesh Pratap Singh wanted to know on what grounds his resolution was declared to be out of order. The Congress President said that there could be no argument on the orders of the President and if Capt. Awadesh Pratap Singh wanted to know anything further he could come and speak to the President.

Shri R.G. Gurjar was called upon to move his resolution. Shri R.G. Gurjar said that he did not want to move his resolution.

Then Shri Babulal Tiwari was called upon to move the resolution standing in his name. Mr. Tiwari moved his resolution on Cow Protection.

Seth Govind Das supported the resolution.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant suggested that discussion on the resolution be adjourned because a bill on the same subject was already moved in the Parliament.

The Congress President asked Shri Banshilal Lohadia to move his amendment, Shri Shankarrao Deo wanted to know from the Congress President his ruling on Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant's suggestion.

The Congress President said that he would consider the point after Shri Banshilal Lohadia, who was already called upon to move his amendment, did so. At this stage Shri Jawaharlal Nehru wanted to oppose the resolution; but since the loudspeaker went out of order, it was considered desirable to adjourn the meeting for tea.

Shri Nehru opposed the resolution when the House reassembled after tea.

After Shri Nehru spoke the Congress President said that he would like to take a vote on Pandit Pant's suggestion. The proposer of the resolution agreed to accept Pt. Govind Ballabh Pant's suggestion and requested that the resolution should be given priority if it was necessary to consider it again when the bill would be disposed of by Parliament.

The Congress President said that he wanted to take votes only on Pandit Pant's suggestion that the discussion on the resolution be adjourned. Votes were taken and Pandit Pant's suggestion was accepted by the House.

Shri Mahabir Singh did not move his resolution about Kashmir as the official resolution moved by the Working Committee regarding Kashmir was accepted by the AICC earlier.

Since the loudspeaker was not working Shri Jogeshwar Prasad did

not want to move his resolution and requested that the next resolution be taken up first.

Shri Shankarrao Deo suggested the adjournment of the House but his suggestion was not agreed to. Shri K. Hanumanthaiyya then moved the following resolution.

AMENDMENT IN THE CONSTITUTION

This meeting of the All-India Congress Committee is of opinion that the distinction between Part A States and Part B States should be forthwith abolished and that Article 371 of the Constitution of India which places Part B states in an inferior position should be deleted.

This meeting, therefore, urges upon the Government of India to take immediate steps to amend the Constitution of India so as to implement the foregoing resolution.

Shri Mahabir Singh supported the resolution. Dr. Y.S. Parmar, Capt. Awadhesh Pratap Singh and Shri Sant Ram Kanga moved their amendments. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru explained the official policy regarding Part B and C states and praised the work of Sardar Patel in this connection. He explained the difficulties of the Government in this regard. The acceptance of this resolution would need an amendment of the Indian Constitution and it would be a difficult process. He felt that it would be better if the resolution was referred to the Working Committee for necessary action.

After Panditji's speech the Congress President wanted to know from the members whether they would like to sit on or would like to adjourn. The members were generally in favour of adjournment. The meeting was adjourned to meet again at 3 P.M. on the next day.

The All-India Congress Committee met again on Sunday, the 6th May 1951 at 3 P.M. in the Constitution Club, New Delhi. Shri Purushottamdas Tandon presided. A total 297 members were present.

The Congress President told the House that besides the seven names proposed the previous day for election to the Central Election Committee, seven more nominations were received in time.

Thakur Bhagwat Prasad, Shri Dharendra Muzumdar, Shri B.S. Hirey, Shri Shankarrao Deo, Shri Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, Smt. Sucheta Kripalani, Shri Dada Dharmadhikari.

The Congress President said that there were fourteen names on the list and those who wanted to withdraw were free to do so. The names of those proposed who were not present can be withdrawn by the proposers.

The names of Shri Thakur Bhagwat Prasad, Shri B.S. Hirey, Shri Shankarrao Deo, Shri Rafi Ahmed Kidwai and Shrimati Kripalani were withdrawn. The House was then told that Shri J.B. Kripalani was not willing to contest the election. As such his name should be withdrawn. Shri K. Hanumanthaiyya wanted to know if any third person apart from the proposed person or the proposer could withdraw any name. The Congress president said that if anyone had been authorised to withdraw one's name that name could be withdrawn.

Maulana Azad said that during the previous four or five days many things had happened about which no authoritative version was given. Some people talked to Acharya J.B. Kripalani. There were many difficulties. Considering all these things he wanted that Shri Rafi Ahmed Kidwai and Shri J.B. Kripalani should come to the Central Election Committee but he understood that they were not prepared to serve on the Committee. "We tried to remove misunderstandings and requested them to work together. There were talks last evening and even this morning. Many things were necessary for unity. To bring Acharya Kripalani and Shri Rafi Ahmed Kidwai on the Central Election Committee was the first step in this direction." Maulana Azad hoped that steps taken by them would bear fruit and that the position would improve. He added that he wanted to make one thing clear. Shri Patil proposed five names to the Central Election Committee on the previous day. He did so in his individual capacity and did not propose the names on behalf of the Working Committee.

Shri Hridaya Narayan Chowdhary withdrew the name of Shri Dharendra Muzumdar. Shri Ravi Shankar Shukla wanted to know if the proposer had obtained the consent of Dada Dharmadhikari for proposing that name. The Congress President said that such a consent was not necessary.

After this the proposer of Dada Dharmadhikari withdrew that name also.

The Congress President announced that only five names remained on the list, and as five persons were to be elected, he declared Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, Shri B.C. Roy, Shri Kamaraj Nadar, Shri Morarji Desai and Shri S. Nijalingappa as duly elected members of the Central Election Committee.

The Congress President said that he had received a note regarding the proceedings of the previous AICC meeting from Shri Pawar. For several reasons the proceedings could not be printed and circulated to

the members. Therefore, he asked Shri Kala Venkata Rao to read out the written proceedings.

Shri Kala Venkata Rao read out the proceedings and they were duly confirmed.

Shri Awari wanted to know what had been done regarding the Vanaspati resolution adopted at the previous meeting of the AICC. The Congress President apprised Mr. Awari of the steps taken by the Government in this regard.

The Congress President then said that he had received a request signed by 22 members of the AICC asking for a secret session of the AICC. He added that he would like to know from the members whether they were in favour of such a proposal and that he would take a vote of the House on that point. If such a meeting was to be held, it could only be held on the following day. When votes were taken 47 members voted in favour of the proposition and 75 against. The proposition was dropped.

After this, the discussion on the Resolution on Part B and C States was resumed. Shri Shankarrao Deo suggested that it would be better if the matter was referred to the Working Committee because Shri Jawaharlal Nehru had already spoken about the difficulties in the matter.

The Congress President said that he had received names of persons who wanted to speak on the resolution and that he wanted to give an opportunity to some of them. After the discussion he would request Shri Hanumanthaiyya to reply.

Shri A.P. Udayabhanu and Shri Vedehi Charan Parashar spoke in favour of the resolution.

Shri Gadadhar Dutta moved for a closure. The motion for closure was carried.

Shri K. Hanumanthaiyya accepted the suggestion of Shri Shankarrao Deo and suggested that the Congress President should invite the Chief Ministers of Part B States and the Presidents of the concerned Pradesh Congress Committees to the Working Committee when this question would be considered by the Committee. He, however, added that it was for the Congress President to give a practical shape to his suggestion and he hoped necessary steps would be taken.

The Congress President asked the House whether he was to take it that the resolution with all the amendments was to be referred to the Working Committee. He said that he would take votes on the point. On

votes being taken Shri Shankarrao Deo's suggestion was unanimously accepted by the House.

The Congress President remarked that it was not necessary to take votes on the amendment separately.

After this Shri Jogeshwar Prashad was called upon to move his resolution regarding decontrol of sugar and cloth. As he was not present, Seth Achal Singh moved it on his behalf.

Shri Rawatmul Kochar supported the resolution. Shri Awari and Shri Pratul Charan Mishra moved amendments.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru opposing the resolution said that the question of controls was a serious one. Lifting controls on one commodity would affect several other commodities. "We have to see that prices of things do not increase. Probably you know that cloth control was lifted some time back and that it had to be reimposed. We have not been able to shake off the effect till now." Shri Jawaharlal Nehru clarified the control policy of the Government of India and requested the members to consider the question of control once for all. There were difficulties if this question was to be taken up again and again. Shri Nehru added that, considering all things, control on certain commodities was essential.

After Shri Gadadhar Dutta spoke on the resolution, Swami Krishnanand moved for closure. There were several other voices also for closure. Votes were taken and closure was accepted. Seth Achal Singh replied to the debate.

The Congress President then read out the resolution and took votes on each amendment. The amendments of Shri Awari and Shri Pratul Chandra Mishra were lost by big majority. Votes were then taken on the main resolution. Only 23 members were in favour of the resolution and a large number were against it. The resolution was lost.

The Congress President announced that non-official resolutions had been discussed for 3 hours and 55 minutes. According to the Constitution, 4 hours have to be allotted for non-official resolutions. Therefore, he wanted to take votes on the suggestion whether further discussion on non-official resolutions should be continued or not. On votes being taken it was decided by a big majority that further discussion was not necessary.

The President made his concluding remarks in Hindi.

After Tandonji's speech Shri Mohanlal Gautam thanked the workers.

The meeting terminated with the singing of Jana Gana Mana.

Document No. 98

Azad and the All-India Congress Committee

Bangalore, July 13-15, 1951

The All-India Congress Committee met on Friday, the 13th July 1951 at 2 P.M. in the Glass House, Lal Baug, Bangalore. Shri Purushottamdas Tandon presided. In all 243 members were present.

In the beginning Bande Mataram was sung.

The Congress President then addressed the House in Hindi and later on gave a gist of the same in English.

The following resolution moved from the chair was passed unanimously all standing:

CONDOLENCE (GENERAL)

The All-India Congress Committee expresses its deep sense of sorrow at the deaths of Shrimati Purnima Banerjee, Shri Mathurdas Tricumji, Shri Raghunandan Saran Sharma and Kunwar Harpal Singh and sympathises with the relatives of the deceased.

2. The proceedings of the AICC meeting held at Delhi on 5th and 6th May 1951 were circulated and were confirmed.

3. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru as Prime Minister presented his report to the All-India Congress Committee. On this report Shri Algurai Shastri, Shri A. Kaleswararao, Shri Udaya Shankar Dube, Shri Mahabir Singh, Shri H.S. Narsaiah, Shri Banarsi Das, Shri Gokulbhai Bhatt, Shri Narendra Nath Sen, Seth Achal Singh and Shri Krishnanand Swami expressed their views.

Shri Sushil Kumar Banerjee then moved for closure. The Congress President took votes on the closure motion and declared that it was accepted by the House.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru then replied to the debate.

4. The draft of the Election Manifesto was distributed to the members. After this the House adjourned for half an hour for tea.

On reassembling Shri Jawaharlal Nehru presented the Election Manifesto to the House and requested the members to adopt it. Shri

Govind Ballabh Pant seconded the resolution for the adoption of the Congress Election Manifesto.

After this the Committee adjourned to meet again at 9.45 P.M. the next day.

The Committee met on Saturday the 14th July, 1951 at 9.45 P.M. in the Glass House, Lal Baug, Bangalore. Shri Purushottamdas Tandon presided. A total of 251 members were present.

Bande Mataram was sung.

Document No. 99

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

New Delhi, January 25–27, 1951

A meeting of the Working Committee was held on 25th January, 1951 at 9 P.M. under the presidentship of Shri Purushottamdas Tandon in the office of the All India Congress Committee. Presence was as follows: Shri Purushottamdas Tandon, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Shri Jagjiwan Ram, Shri Atulya Ghosh, Seth Govind Das, Shri B.S. Hirey, Shri Gokul Lal Asawa, Shri Siddinath Sharma, Shri Laxmi Narayan 'Sudhanshu', Prof. N. G. Ranga, Shri Kamaraj Nadar, Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon, Shri Kala Venkata Rao, Shri Mohanlal Gautam and Shri S.K. Patil. Shri Nijalingappa, Shri Harekrishna Mahtab, Shri Shankarrao Deo, Shri Vishwanath Das, Shri Dwarka Prasad Misra and Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya were present by special invitation.

The Working Committee adopted the following resolution on the sad demise of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel:

The Working Committee record their deep grief at the passing away of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel. His great leadership and magnificent services to the Congress and the Nation in the struggle for freedom and subsequently in building up, consolidating and unifying the country will ever be remembered and be an inspiration to his countrymen.

2. The Working Committee considered the amendments received for the first four articles of the proposed Draft Constitution. Some amendments were accepted.

3. The Working Committee considered the letters received from Ajmer Provincial Congress Committee and Rajputana Provincial Congress Committee regarding the merger of Ajmer Provincial Congress Committee into Rajputana Provincial Congress Committee. It was decided that for the present Ajmer should remain a separate Provincial Congress Committee and the question of its merger with Rajasthan should be dropped.

4. The Working Committee considered the question of official resolutions to be placed before the All-India Congress Committee at

Ahmedabad. How to make the Congress strong, remove dissensions and bring back people who had gone out was also considered. Further discussion on the subject was adjourned for the next meeting.

The Committee then adjourned to meet again at 3 P.M..

The Working Committee met again in the afternoon at 3 P.M. under the presidentship of Shri Purushottamdas Tandon in the All-India Congress Committee office. Presence was as follows:

Purushottamdas Tandon, Jagjiwan Ram, Gokul Lal Asawa, Siddhinath Sharma, S.K. Patil, Laxmi Narayan 'Sudhanshu', Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon, B.S. Hirey, Atulya Ghosh, Seth Govind Das, Kamaraj Nadar, Kala Venkata Rao, Mohanlal Gautam, Brijlal Biyani was present by special invitation.

The Committee considered amendments received to other articles of the proposed Draft Constitution. Some amendments were accepted and it was decided that the amended form of the articles be placed before the meeting of the All-India Congress Committee at Ahmedabad.

The Working Committee then adjourned to meet on 26th January at 2 P.M. under the presidentship of Shri Purushettamdas Tandon in the office of the All-India Congress Committee. Presence was as follows:

Purushottamdas Tandon, Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Jagjiwan Ram, Atulya Ghosh, Siddhinath Sharma, Gokul Lal Asawa, B.S. Hirey, Seth Govind Das, Laxmi Narayan 'Sudhanshu', Kamaraj Nadar, N.G. Ranga, Kala Venkata Rao and Mohanlal Gautam. Vishwanath Das, Brijlal Biyani, Dwarka Prasad Misra, Shankarrao Deo, S. Nijalingappa, Harekrishna Mahtab and Gulzarilal Nanda were present by special invitation.

1. The amendments to the proposed Draft Constitution accepted in the previous meeting were read out.

2. Dr. Gopichand Bhargava's letter regarding memorial for Sardar Patel was read out and considered. It was pointed out that Gujarat Provincial Congress Committee was doing something in this connection. All the members were in favour of erecting a memorial but the decision regarding the proposed memorial was adjourned so that it might be ascertained as to what the Gujarat Provincial Congress Committee was doing in the matter.

3. There was further discussion regarding Congress organisation.

The Committee then adjourned to meet at 9 A.M. on 27th January 1951.

The adjourned meeting of the Working Committee was held on 27th January 1951 at 9 P.M. in the office of the All-India Congress Committee under the presidentship of Shri Purushottamdas Tandon. Presence was as follows:

Purushottamdas Tandon, Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Jagjiwan Ram, N.G. Ranga, Gokul Lal Asawa, Siddhinath Sharma, Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon, B.S. Hirey, Atulya Ghosh, Seth Govind Das, Laxmi Narayan 'Sudhanshu', Kamaraj Nadar, Kala Venkata Rao, Mohanlal Gautam, Shankarrao Deo, Dwarka Prasad Mishra, Vishwanath Das, S. Nijalingappa, Brijlal Biyani, Gulzarilal Nanda were present by special invitation.

1. The question of unity among Congressmen was considered. It was decided that Shri Jawaharlal Nehru should prepare a draft resolution based on the discussion in the Committee and that it should be considered at Ahmedabad.

2. The question of filling Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel's vacancy in the Parliamentary Board was considered. Shri Atulya Ghosh proposed that Shri Dwarka Prasad Misra be elected to the vacancy. Shri Atulya Ghosh's proposal was accepted and Shri Dwarka Prasad Misra was elected a member of the Central Parliamentary Board.

3. The Committee considered the letter from Tamilnadu Congress Committee in which they had requested the Working Committee to appoint a Provincial Election Tribunal and a Provincial Credentials Committee for Tamilnadu. Shri Dwarka Prasad Misra was authorised to put forward his suggestions in this connection after consulting the people concerned.

4. The Committee considered the question about the formation of West Bengal Provincial Election Tribunal. It was decided that the West Bengal Provincial Congress Committee should hold a meeting and elect their Provincial Election Tribunal according to the rules.

5. The Working Committee considered the complaints against the election of some office-bearers in Tamilnadu, Delhi, Madhya Bharat and Vidarbha.

The Working Committee appointed a special Sub-Committee consisting of Shri B.S. Hirey, Seth Govind Das and Shri Jagjiwan Ram and authorised the Committee to go into the complaints and give their decisions.

6. The Committee considered the question about renewal of the fixed deposit standing in the name of Andhra Provincial Congress

Committee. The Congress President was authorised to take necessary steps in the matter.

7. The Committee considered the letter received from the Delhi Improvement Trust regarding the site for Congress House in Delhi. It was decided that the question be considered later on.

8. The letter from Uttar Pradesh Congress Committee regarding fresh enrolment of Congress members in Fatchpur district was produced.

It was decided that the question be considered later.

9. The letter received from Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee regarding the formation of Karnatak Province on linguistic basis was read and considered.

It was decided that the Congress President should write a letter to the Government of India in this connection drawing the attention to the fact that the Congress had to make a mention in its election manifesto about the formation of linguistic provinces. Government should, therefore, be requested to consider this question and to decide priorities.

10. The letter regarding Manbhumi was read out.

It was decided that full information should be collected regarding the work of the previous Sub-Committee which was appointed for the purpose.

The Working Committee then adjourned to meet at 3 P.M.

* * * *

The Working Committee again met at 3 P.M. in the office of the All-India Congress Committee under the presidentship of Shri Purushottamdas Tandon. All the members and invitees present in the morning sitting attended the afternoon sitting.

1. The Congress Working Committee adopted the following resolution on the demise of Shri Amritlal Thakkar:

CONDOLENCE (AMRITLAL THAKKAR)

The Committee expresses its deep sorrow at the demise of Shri Amritlal Thakkar, whose work in the cause of Harijans and backward classes will be remembered with gratitude and affection and whose life will continue to be an inspiration to his countrymen.

2. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's draft resolution regarding Congress organisation was read and considered. It was decided that it should be finally considered at Ahmedabad.

When discussing about the Congress organisation, the Committee considered the question of Congress Democratic Front. In this connection

the letter sent by the Congress President to Shri Kripalani on 7th December, 1950 was read out.

Shri Kripalani's reply dated 10th December, 1950 and the letter sent by the Congress President on 20th January, 1951 in reply were also read out.

In view of the resolution to be put forward in the forthcoming meeting of the All-India Congress Committee at Ahmedabad, no decision was taken regarding Congress Democratic Front.

The Committee then adjourned to meet again at Ahmedabad.

Document No. 100

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

Ahmedabad, January 29, 1951

The Working Committee met on 29th January, 1951 at 9 A.M. under the presidentship of Shri Purushottamdas Tandon in the Navjiwan Office at Ahmedabad. The presence was as follows:

Purushottamdas Tandon, Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Jagjiwan Ram, Atulya Ghosh, Kamraj Nadar, Gokul Lal Asawa, Laxmi Narayan 'Sudhanshu', Siddhinath Sharma, B.S. Hirey, S.K. Patil, Smt. Pushpavati Mehta, Seth Govind Das, Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon, N.G. Ranga, Kala Venkata Rao and Mohanlal Gautam. Harekrishna Mahtab, Vishwanath Das, Dwarka Prasad Misra, Brijlal Biyani, S. Nijalingappa, Gulzarilal Nanda, Shankarrao Deo and Smt. Maniben Patel were present by special invitation.

1. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's draft resolution was read out and accepted.

(For text see proceedings of the AICC dated 29th January, 1951).

2. The Non-official resolutions received were considered and it was decided that they should be opposed by the Working Committee.

The Committee then adjourned.

Document No. 101

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

Ahmedabad, January 31, 1951

The Working Committee met on 31st January 1951 at 3-30 p.m. in the Navjiwan Office, Ahmedabad under the presidentship of Shri Purushottamdas Tandon. The presence was as follows:

Purushottamdas Tandon, Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, C. Rajagopalachari, Jagjiwan Ram, Gokul Lal Asawa, S.K. Patil, Smt. Pushpawati Mehta, Atulya Ghosh, Laxmi Narayan 'Sudhanshu', Siddhinath Sharma, Kamaraj Nadar, N.G. Ranga, B.S. Hirey, Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon, Seth Govind Das, Kala Venkata Rao and Mohanlal Gautam. Dwarka Prasad Misra, Brijlal Biyani, Smt. Maniben Patel, Shankarrao Deo, S. Nijalingappa, Harekrishna Mahtab, Vishwanath Das and Gulzarilal Nanda were present by special invitation.

The question of appointment of the Central Election Tribunal under the new Constitution was considered. It was decided that the proposed names be placed before the next meeting of the Working Committee.

2. The Committee considered how the Unity Resolution adopted by the All-India Congress Committee could be implemented. In this connection the Congress President and Shri Jawaharlal Nehru were authorised to talk to the people concerned to find out their complaints and how they could be remedied.

3. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru expressed his views on the international situation.

The committee then adjourned *sine die*.

Document No. 102

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

New Delhi, February 25 & 26, 1951

The Working Committee met on 25th February, 1951 at 2-30 P.M. at the residence of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. The following members were present:

Purushottamdas Tandon, Jawaharlal Nehru, C. Rajagopalachari, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, Seth Govind Das, K. Kamaraj Nadar, Gokul Lal Asawa, N.G. Ranga, S. Pratap Singh, Kala Venkata Rao and Mohanlal Gautam.

The following were present by special invitation.

Dr. B.P. Sitaramayya, Shankarrao Deo, Gulzarilal Nanda, D.P. Misra, S. Nijalingappa and Smt. Maniben Patel.

1. The Working Committee discussed generally the question of implementing the AICC resolution on unity, adopted at Ahmedabad.

2. The Working Committee discussed the reply received from Shri T. Prakasam to the notice sent to him on 6th April 1950. The letter of Shri Mohanlal Gautam addressed to Shri T. Prakasam on 8th December 1950 and Shri Prakasam's reply to the Congress President on 26th December 1950 were also read. The Working Committee adopted the following resolution:

T. PRAKASAM

Having read the notice last issued to Shri T. Prakasam and his explanation and having once again considered the whole course of his conduct in this regard, the Working Committee hold that Shri T. Prakasam is guilty of gross indiscipline and disregard of his duty as a member of the Congress. But the Committee in view of his age do not propose to take any further action beyond this expression and their grave displeasure. This will not preclude any action the Congress Legislature Party in Madras may deem fit and necessary.

Prof. N.G. Ranga dissented. Prof. Ranga requested permission to express his opinion publicly but was refused permission to do so.

3. The question of the enrolment of Congress primary members under the new Constitution was considered. It was resolved that the enrolment should start without any delay.

The Congress President was authorised to finalise the primary and active membership forms.

4. The letter from the U.P.C.C. regarding the formation of the Fatehpur DCC was considered. It was resolved that the enrolment of primary members under the new Constitution should be taken up and pending the formation of a DCC, an *ad hoc* Committee nominated by the UPCC should function.

The meeting was then adjourned.

* * * *

The Working Committee met again on 25th February, 1951 at 8.30 A.M. at Maulana Abul Kalam Azad's residence. The following members were present:

Messrs Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, C. Rajagopalachari, Purushottamdas Tandon, Govind Ballabh Pant, Seth Govind Das, K. Kamaraj Nadar, Gokul Lal Asawa, Sardar Pratap Singh, Prof. N.G. Ranga, B.S. Hirey, Kala Venkata Rao and Mohanlal Gautam.

The following were present by special invitation:

Shankarrao Deo, Gulzarilal Nanda, D.P. Misra, S. Nijalingappa and Smt. Maniben Patel.

The Working Committee discussed the resolution regarding vanaspati passed by the AICC at Ahmedabad. Letters from Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and Shri Radha Krishna Bajaj were also read out. After some discussion the Committee decided not to express any definite opinion at this stage and to wait for the report of the Committee appointed to go into the question by the Government of India.

* * * *

The Committee met again in the afternoon at 2-30 in Parliament House in the Prime Minister's room. All those who attended the morning sitting except Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, were present. Shri Jagiwan Ram was also present. Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya was also present as an invitee.

1. The question of appointing a Central Election Tribunal and a Central Credentials Committee was considered. Shri Purushottamdas Tandon, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and Shri C. Rajagopalachari were authorised to select the personnel of the two Committees.

2. Shri D.P. Misra made his recommendation regarding the Tamilnadu Pradesh Election Tribunal and the Pradesh Credentials Committee. The Working Committee appointed Shri V. Bhashyam Iyengar, Shri C.R. Pattabhi Raman and Shri T.P. Minakshisundaran to form the Pradesh Election Tribunal and Shri S.R. Venkataraman, Shri T.A. Ananta Aiyer and Shri K. Balasubramanya Iyer to form the Pradesh Credentials Committee.

3. The Working Committee considered the complaint against the Delhi Pradesh Election Tribunal and decided that the matter should be referred to the Central Election Tribunal when it is formed.

4. The report of Shri S.K. Patil regarding the election of delegates in Andhra was read and discussed. It was decided that in view of the fact that more than two-thirds of the total number of delegates have been elected, the Andhra Pradesh Congress Committee should be duly constituted. It was also decided that Shri S.K. Patil be requested to call a meeting of the Andhra PCC in the last week of March 1951 and preside over it. The meeting would elect the office-bearers and the executive of the PCC. All the members declared elected till now and those who might be duly declared elected before the date of the meeting would take part in the meeting. A notice of fifteen clear days should be given for the meeting. Those elected after the notice was issued might also take part in the meeting but they should not claim a fifteen days' notice. Shri Patil was requested to hold elections under the rules made by the Working Committee, as far as possible, for all the vacancies in the constituencies in which court injunctions have been or might in future be raised.

5. The question of the formation of a Pradesh Congress Committee for Hyderabad under the new Constitution was considered. It was decided that, for the present, an *ad hoc* Committee should be formed to function as a Pradesh Congress Committee and that it should consist of members of the executive committee of the All-Hyderabad Congress Committee and President and Secretaries of the Provincial Congress Committee in Hyderabad. The Congress President might nominate not more than three members on this *ad hoc* Committee.

6. The Congress President placed before the Committee the correspondence that had passed between him and Shri J.B. Kripalani. The President was requested to inform Shri Kripalani that it would not be desirable to release the correspondence at this stage but, if he so desired, he could do so.

The meeting then adjourned *sine die*.

Document No. 103

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

New Delhi, April 7 & 8, 1951

The Working Committee met on Saturday the 7th April 1951 at 8.30 A.M. at the office of the All-India Congress Committee, Shri Purushottamdas Tandon presided. The following members were present:

Purushottamdas Tandon, Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, C. Rajagopalachari, Pt. Govind Ballabh Pant, Smt. Maniben Patel, B.S. Hirey, Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon, S.K. Patil, Gokul Lal Asawa, Siddhinath Sarma, Laxminarain Sudhanshu, Atulya Ghosh, Jagjiwan Ram, Mohanlal Gautam and Seth Govind Das.

Kala Venkata Rao, Morarji Desai, Gulzarilal Nanda, Vishwanath Das, Pattabhi Sitaramayya, Dwarka Prasad Misra, Sampurnanand, Dr. B.C. Roy, Anugraha Narayan Sinha, and S. Nijalingappa were present by special invitation.

1. The proceedings of the Working Committee meetings dated 22nd to 25th November 1950, 4th and 5th December 1950, 25th to 31st January 1951 and 25th and 26th February 1951 were circulated.

3. The Working Committee considered the letter from West Bengal Pradesh Congress Committee dated 28th February 1951 in which they requested the Working Committee to authorise the West Bengal Pradesh Credentials Committee to act as the Pradesh Election Tribunal. According to the Congress Constitution the Central Election Tribunal alone can appoint a Pradesh Election Tribunal under stated circumstances. Therefore, it was resolved that the Central Election Tribunal, when constituted, will appoint the West Bengal Pradesh Election Tribunal. If, in the meantime, the Bengal High Court vacated the injunction against the election of the Pradesh Election Tribunal, the West Bengal Pradesh Congress Committee might elect its tribunal.

3. There was a discussion about the Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel Memorial Fund. Members were of the opinion that the funds collected should be used only for some specified purposes like the construction of village roads, village wells and other means of water supply and village school buildings.

It was decided that Shri Jawaharlal Nehru should draft a resolution and an appeal on behalf of the Working Committee.

4. The question of holding the next AICC meeting was then considered. It was decided that the next meeting of the AICC be held at Delhi on 5th, 6th and 7th May, 1951.

5. The note of the General Secretary regarding General Elections was read out.

(a) It was decided that the Election Manifesto be prepared by the Central Parliamentary Board and be placed before the next meeting of the AICC.

(b) It was decided that a blue-print for the General Elections be prepared by the General Secretaries and placed before the Central Parliamentary Board and on its approval be placed before the Central Election Committee.

(c) It was decided that all Pradesh Congress Committees be asked to elect their Pradesh Election Committees by the end of May.

Some members invited the attention of the Working Committee to the People's Representation Bill pending before Parliament as reported upon by the Select Committee and opined that many objectionable provisions, especially the disqualification clauses, should be amended. It was decided that a note may be prepared regarding the objectionable points and sent to the Prime Minister for consideration.

* * * *

The Working Committee met again at 3 P.M. the same day at the office of the All-India Congress Committee. Those present in the morning were present in the evening also. Shri Purushottamdas Tandon presided.

1. Shri Prakasam's letter dated 12th March to Shri Mohanlal Gautam was read out.

The Working Committee were of the view that there was no ground for revising their earlier decision dated 25th February 1951.

2. Shri S.B. Hirey's letter regarding the accounts of the Reception Committee of the 56th Indian National Congress at Nasik was read. According to the constitution the accounts of the Reception Committee have to be submitted to the AICC within six months from the date of the Congress Session. In the aforesaid letter Shri Hirey requested for an extension of time.

The Reception Committee was requested to send the accounts forthwith. The audited report could be sent later on..

3. A letter from Shri Jai Narain Vyas regarding the formation of Ministry in Rajasthan was considered. It was felt that the Central Parliamentary Board had to be in general charge of the formation and the working of ministries. In his letter Shri Jai Narain Vyas referred to the decision of the Working Committee in July 1949. That decision was taken under the special circumstances prevailing at that time and did not hold good now. Further, that resolution did not deal with the formation of ministries as such.

4. A letter from the West Godavari District Congress Committee dated 5th April, 1951 requesting for the extension of time to take action against certain Congressmen was considered and the extension of time asked for was granted.

5. A letter from the States Ministry dated 15th July, 1950 was read in which they requested for the refund of Rs. 51,111 presented at Rewa to the then President of the Congress, Dr. Rajendra Prasad. It was decided to obtain fuller details.

6. The resignations from certain Congressmen of Manbhum were placed before the Working Committee. It was decided that Shri Jagjiwan Ram and Shri Kala Venkata Rao should do the needful in the matter.

7. There was a discussion regarding Congress Democratic Front. The Congress President read out all the letters written by him to Shri Kripalani and also the replies received from him. Consideration of the matter was adjourned to the next sitting.

The meeting then adjourned to meet again at 8.30 A.M.. on 8th April, 1951.

Document No. 104

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

New Delhi, February 2 & 3, 1952

The Congress Working Committee met on Saturday the 2nd February, 1952 at 11 A.M. in the office of the All India Congress Committee under the presidentship of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. Presence was as follows:

Messrs. Jawaharlal Nehru, Abul Kalam Azad, Pratap Singh Kairon, Morarji Desai, Purushottamdas Tandon, Nabakrishna Choudhary, Kamaraj Nadar, Shankarrao Deo, Sanjiva Reddy, Manikyalal Verma, Gulzarilal Nanda, Govind Ballabh Pant, B.S. Hirey, Lal Bahadur Shastri and U.S. Malliah. S. Nijalingappa, T.T. Krishnamachari, B.G. Kher, P.S. Kumaraswami Raja, K. Santhanam, Anugraha Narain Sinha, Khandubhai Desai, Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, B.C. Roy, Sri Prakasa, Hare Krishna Mahtab, Jagjiwan Ram, K.N. Katju were present by special invitation.

The Congress President expressed his views regarding the General Elections. Messrs. B.G. Kher, T.T. Krishnamachari, Sanjiva Reddy, Kamaraj Nadar, Manikyalal Verma, Pratap Singh Kairon, B.C. Roy, Nijalingappa and Anugraha Narain Sinha put before the Committee their experiences of the General Election in their own provinces.

The Working Committee then adjourned to meet again at 3.30 P.M.

* * * *

The Working Committee met again in the afternoon at 3.30 P.M. Besides the persons present in the morning meeting Shri Krishna Sinha, Dr. Syed Mohammed, Shri C. Kesavan, Shri T.M. Verghese, Shri V.O. Markos and Shri K.P. Madhavan Nair were also present.

Shri Kesavan, Shri Madhavan Nair and Shri T.M. Verghese expressed their views regarding Travancore Cochin elections. In the discussion Shri K.P. Madhavan Nair was the spokesman. Shri Sri Krishna Sinha and Dr. Kailash Nath Katju then placed before the Committee their election experiences in Bihar and Madhya Bharat respectively.

The meeting adjourned to meet at 3.30 P.M. the next day.

The Working Committee met on Sunday the 3rd February, 1952 at 3.30 P.M. in the office of the All India Congress Committee under the presidentship of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.

Except Shri Purushottamdas Tandon all the members who attended the previous day's meeting were present. Amongst the special invitees Shri Sri Krishna Sinha, Dr. Syed Mohammed and Shri Jai Narain Vyas were present besides those who were present in the morning sitting of the previous day.

1. The question of selecting Congress candidates for the Legislative Councils and Council of States was discussed.

The following decision was taken regarding the selection of Congress candidates for the Legislative Councils:

The Working Committee decides that in regard to election of Legislative Councils in Bicameral Legislatures, the Pradesh Election Committee should determine the procedure of selection of Congress candidates in consultation with the Leader of the Party in the State concerned. They shall have discretion to put up as many candidates as they think necessary in each category, subject to the maximum number of seats. In selecting candidates special attention be given to women and minorities that have not been adequately represented and eminent men in professions—Labour, Industry, Science and Art. Unless there are special considerations, persons who have been defeated in the General Elections, should not be put up.

Intimation should be sent to the AICC Office of all those who were selected.

No applicants should be invited. If any applications have been received by the PCCs they should be returned with the money received, if any.

2. The following decision was taken regarding the selection of Congress candidates for the Council of States:

The Working Committee decides that in regard to the Council of States election, the Pradesh Election Committees should make recommendations to the Central Election Committee. No applicants should be invited.

3. The following decision was taken regarding the election of leaders in Bicameral Legislatures:

The Working Committee decides that in States having Bicameral Legislatures, the party will consist of members of both Houses. The election of the leaders should take place after the election of both

Houses is completed. Till such election, the leader of the present party will continue.

4. The Working Committee decided to hold the next meeting of the All India Congress Committee at Calcutta on the 22nd and 23rd March, 1952.

5. The last date for enrolment of primary members was fixed as 31st May, 1952.

6. It was also decided to hold the next meeting of the Working Committee on the 8th and 9th March, 1952 at Delhi.

7. The Working Committee appointed a Sub-Committee consisting of:

Messrs. Jawaharlal Nehru, K.N. Katju, Sri Prakasa, H.K. Mahtab, Gulzarilal Nanda, K. Santhanam, Khandubhai Desai, Lal Bahadur Shastri and U.S. Malliah to suggest amendments to the Congress constitution with a view to making the Organisation more effective and disciplined for national service.

8. The proceedings of the Working Committee meeting dated the 15th October, 1952 were confirmed.

9. Copies of the budget of the All India Congress Committee for 1952 were distributed to the members. Consideration of the budget was postponed to the next meeting. A Sum of Rs. 55,000 was sanctioned for the expenses in January, February and March, 1952.

10. The Congress President apprised the members with election expenses.

11. A sub-committee consisting of Messrs. K.N. Katju, Sri Prakasa, K. Santhanam and T.T. Krishnamachari was formed to study the question of filling the return of election expenses.

The Working Committee then adjourned to meet on the 7th March, 1952.

Document No. 105

Maulana Azad and Congress Working Committee

New Delhi, March 7 & 8, 1952

The Congress Working Committee met on Friday the 7th March, 1952 at 11 A.M. in the office of the All-India Congress Committee under the presidentship of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. Presence was as follows:

Messrs. Jawaharlal Nehru, Shankarrao Deo, U.S. Malliah, Morarji Desai, Lal Bahadur Shastri, Munnuswami Pillai, Pratap Singh Kairon, Sanjeeva Reddy, Kamaraj Nadar, Abul Kalam Azad, Manikyalal Verma and Govind Ballabh Pant.

Dr. B.C. Roy, Satya Narain Sinha, Jagjiwan Ram, Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, S.K. Sinha, Dr. K.N. Katju, A.N. Sinha, H.K. Mahtab, Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, Govind Das and Dr. Syed Mahmud were special invitees.

The proceedings of the Working Committee meeting dated the 2nd and 3rd February, 1952 were confirmed.

The Congress President placed before the Committee various points which had been brought to his notice regarding the Bombay Pradesh Congress Committee. After discussion it was decided that the Congress President should place a draft resolution on the subject in the next meeting of the Working Committee.

There was a general discussion regarding the formation of ministries in Madras and Travancore-Cochin. The Committee thought it proper that the formation of ministries in those two places should be in accordance with the advice given by the Congress President to those states.

There was discussion regarding the Agenda for the All-India Congress Committee meeting at Calcutta. It was decided to have resolutions on the following subjects:

- (a) Communalism and Congress;
- (b) Congress Organisation and its programme;
- (c) Amendments to the Congress Constitution.

The Congress President said that instead of changing the constitution, it would be better to pass resolutions on the subjects in which changes were necessary and then work according to them. The constitution could be changed in future in the light of the experiences gained. The meeting then adjourned to the next day.

* * * *

The Working Committee met again on Saturday the 8th March, 1952 at 10 A.M. under the presidentship of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru in the office of the All-India Congress Committee. Besides the members present in the previous day's meeting, Shri B.S. Hirey also attended.

1. There was discussion on the Congress President's draft resolutions regarding Communalism and Congress, and Congress organisation. There was discussion regarding the changes in the Congress constitution. The Congress President was authorised to redraft the resolutions and place them before the next Working Committee meeting at Calcutta.

2. The question of ministers being office-bearers in their respective PCCs was considered. No decision was taken and the question was adjourned to be decided later.

3. The question of reducing the primary membership fee was considered but no decision was taken.

The meeting then adjourned to 21st March 1952.

Document No. 106

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

Calcutta, March 21–24, 1952

The Congress Working Committee met on Friday the 21st March, 1952 at 4 P.M. in the Working Committee Pandal at Lake Area, Calcutta under the presidentship of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. The presence was as follows:

Messrs. Jawaharlal Nehru, Abul Kalam Azad, Purushottamdas Tandon, Govind Ballabh Pant, Pratap Singh Kairon, Manikyalal Verma, Kamaraj Nadar, Sanjeeva Reddy, Morarji Desai, Shankarrao Deo, B.S. Hirey, C. ulzarilal Nanda, Lal Bahadur Shastri and U.S. Malliah.

Dr. B.C. Roy, S. Nijalingappa, Jagjiwan Ram, Satyanarayan Sinha, Sri Krishna Sinha, Anugraha Narain Sinha, Kailash Nath Katju, Hare Krishna Mahtab, Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, Smt. A.V. Kuttimalu Amma, S.K. Patil, B.G. Kher, Seth Govind Das, Syed Mahmud, Atulya Ghosh and Dr. B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya were present by invitation.

1. The proceedings of the last meeting of the Working Committee dated 8th March, 1952 were confirmed.

2. The Committee considered the draft resolution on “General Political Situation in the Country and the Congress”. It was discussed and adopted for being placed before the AICC.

3. The draft resolution on “Communalism and Other Disruptive and Separatist Tendencies” was discussed and adopted for being placed before the AICC.

4. The resolution on “Foreign Policy” was discussed and adopted for being placed before the AICC.

5. The resolution on “South Africa” was considered and adopted for being placed before the AICC.

6. The printed copies of the accounts of the AICC duly audited for 15 months ending 31st December, 1951 were distributed. The budget for the year 1952 was also distributed.

The Committee then adjourned to meet at 8.30 A.M. the next day.

The Committee met again at 8.30 A.M. on Saturday the 22nd March, 1952 at the same place under the presidentship of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.

1. The Committee considered the draft resolution on "Immediate Programme". It was discussed and adopted for being placed before the AICC.

2. The Committee considered the draft resolution on "Self-sufficiency in Food." It was discussed and adopted for being placed before the AICC.

3. The Committee considered the proposed amendments to the Congress Constitution and decided to make the following recommendations to the AICC :

(a) Primary membership fee be reduced to As. 4; active members to pay an additional Re. 1.

(b) Proviso of Article IV (b) of active members being primary members for two years be deleted.

(c) The present system of Congress Election Tribunals has proved complicated, dilatory and unsatisfactory. It should, therefore, be revised completely with a view to speedy disposal of complaints.

4. The auditor's note on the AICC accounts for the period ending 31st December 1951 was considered. The replies to the auditors' objections were also considered. The following decisions were taken:

(i) During the elections Rs. 14,00,000 were transferred from Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel Account No. 1 to the Central Election Committee Account. The action was confirmed.

(ii) Rs. 1,00,000 were transferred to the general fund of the AICC from Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel Account No. 1. This action was also confirmed.

(iii) The committee resolved that the Auditors' Report be adopted and the audited accounts of the AICC for fifteen months ending 31st December 1951 be circulated to the members of the AICC.

5. The Congress President told the Committee that a number of non-official resolutions had been received. They were all balloted. After the ballot he went through them, ruled some of them out of order and put the others in proper language. The first nine of these resolutions were circulated to the members.

(i) The first resolution, of Shri Narendra Nath Sen of West Bengal was as follows:

The Working Committee be requested to make an enquiry about

the general elections and to make a report as to the causes of success and failure of candidates, and also in regard to the conduct of such Congressmen against whom complaints may have been received in connection with the general elections.

It was decided that a fair and full discussion should be allowed and that the AICC should be asked to refer it to the Working Committee.

(ii) The Second resolution, of Shri Kamakshya Prasad Tripathi of Assam, ran as follows:

The AICC is of opinion that Congress Governments should be formed so as to make them as representative as possible. At the same time, ministers, even though belonging to a minority community, must have the confidence of the entire party and must share in the joint responsibility of the Ministry.

It was decided that it was not proper to discuss the resolution in the AICC although it was based on good principles.

(iii) The third resolution, of Shri Hripat Singh of Bihar, was as follows:

In view of the fact that the Chhota Nagpur division of Bihar Pradesh has special problems this division should be declared a separate Congress Pradesh, consisting of the districts of Ranchi, Hazaribagh, Manbhum, Singhbhum and the Santhal Parganas, with its headquarters at Ranchi.

It was decided that it should be opposed.

(iv) Shri Basantlal Murarka's resolution was as follows:

The AICC recommends that the control of all articles (such as sugar, cloth, etc.) but excepting cereals (such as rice, wheat, etc.) should be removed.

It was decided to oppose the resolution if the mover wanted to press it.

(v) The fifth resolution, of Shri C.E. Bharaten of Kerala, was as follows:

The AICC regrets the delay in the peaceful transfer of foreign settlements in India to the Indian Union. Such a transfer is essential from the point of view of the removal of any element of foreign domination in India and for the unity and security of India. Early steps should, therefore, be taken for this peaceful transfer.

It was decided that this may be allowed to be discussed.

6. The following condolence resolution was adopted for being moved in the AICC.

CONDOLENCE

The All-India Congress Committee expresses its deep sense of sorrow and loss at the deaths of—

1. Lala Deshbandhu Gupta, 2. Darbar Gopaldas Desai and 3. Thakur Lal Singh.

The Committee then adjourned to meet again on the 24th of March.

* * * *

The Working Committee met on Monday the 24th March, 1952 at 9.30 A.M. in the Working Committee Pandal at Lake Area, Calcutta under the presidentship of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.

All the members except Shri Shankarrao Deo and Shri Munnuswami Pillai, were present.

The following special invitees were also present:

Dr. B.C. Roy, Shri S. Nijalingappa, Shri Jagjiwan Ram, Shri Satyanarain Sinha, Shri Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, Shri Hare Krishna Mahtab, Shri Anugraha Narain Sinha, Syed Mahmud, Seth Govind Das, Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, Smt. A.V. Kuttimalu Amma and Shri Atulya Ghosh.

1. The AICC budget for 1952 copies of which had already been circulated was considered. At the outset, the Congress President said that it was a normal routine budget and it did not indicate any extra activities which would have to be taken up later. He made it clear that supplementary budget would be prepared to include additional schemes of national service, publications, "Congress Sandesh", etc.

The Committee decided that Congress Bulletin, Economic Review and Arthik Sameeksha be stopped. It was, however, decided that the essential part of the Congress Bulletin should form a separate part of the Congress Sandesh.

The Committee adopted the budget with the above-mentioned provisions.

2. The Committee considered Swami Ramanand Tirath's letter regarding Hyderabad Pradesh *ad hoc* Committee. The following decision was taken.

In view of the fact that the AICC has asked for fresh elections of Executive Committees of the PCCs, DCCs, etc. and as elections cannot take place in Hyderabad for five or six months, the Congress President is authorised to nominate another *ad hoc* Congress Committee in

consultation with the leading Congressmen of Hyderabad. This committee should function till the regular elections take place there.

3. The General Secretaries note regarding Congress Election Programme was considered. The following decisions were taken:

- (i) The final date of enrolment of primary members be fixed as 30th June, 1952.
- (ii) The delegate elections should take place in the second half of September.
- (iii) The Committee suggested that the next session of the Congress be held in the later half of November or December. The exact date be fixed in consultation with the Congress Committee of the place selected for holding the Session.
- (iv) Provisionally Orissa was selected for holding the session. In this connection, it was decided that the Orissa PCC be asked to send a rough sketch of their plans regarding site, finances and other arrangements.
- (v) Smt. A.V. Kuttimalu Amma raised a question about the separation of Malabar from Travancore-Cochin. The Committee adopted the following decision:
In regard to the proposal to have Travancore-Cochin as the separate Pradesh Congress Committee, the opinion of the DCCs and the people be invited.
- (vi) Shri Gulzarilal Nanda apprised the Committee about his ideas regarding Planning and the Five-Year Plan of the Planning Commission.

The Committee then adjourned *sine die*.

Document No. 107

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

New Delhi, May 31–June 2, 1952

The Working Committee met on Saturday, the 31st May 1952 at 3 P.M. at the Prime Minister's House under the presidentship of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. The presence was as follows:

Messrs: Jawaharlal Nehru, Purushottamdas Tandon, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Pratap Singh Kairon, Govind Ballabh Pant, Gulzarilal Nanda, Manikya Lal Verma, Kamaraj Nadar, Sanjeeva Reddy, B.S. Hirey, Lal Bahadur Shastri and U.S. Malliah.

The following persons were present by special invitation:

Messrs: B.G. Kher, K.N. Katju, Dr. B.C. Roy, S. Nijalingappa, Jagjiwan Ram, Satyanarain Sinha, Hare Krishna Mahtab, Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, Sampurnanand, Syed Mahmud, Khandubhai Desai, Atulya Ghosh, U.N. Dhebar and Govind Das.

Proceedings of the meeting of the Working Committee at Calcutta on the 21st, 22nd and 24th March 1952 were confirmed.

It was decided at the Calcutta meeting of the Working Committee that the next meeting of the AICC be held at Hyderabad and that the next Congress Session be held at Bhubaneshwar. The Utkal PCC, however, later informed the Working Committee of their inability to hold the Congress Session in Utkal. The whole question was therefore reviewed.

The Working Committee decided that the next meeting of the AICC be held at Indore and the Congress Session at Hyderabad.

At its Calcutta meeting the AICC fixed an additional fee of Re. 1 per year for the active members. With regard to the disbursement of active membership fee, the Committee resolved that the distribution of this fee should be in the same proportion as the primary membership fee amongst the various committees as per schedule given in Article IV (c) of the Congress constitution.

The Committee considered the resolutions of the Kerala PCC and its constituent DCCs for bifurcating the existing Kerala PCC into two

separate PCCs of Malabar and Travancore-Cochin. The Committee then resolved to create a separate Congress province for Malabar and another for Travancore-Cochin by bifurcating the existing Kerala PCC.

The Committee took note of the recent events in Madras and Travancore-Cochin and of the Congress affairs in PEPSU, especially the internal dissensions there.

The Committee authorised the Congress President and the Secretaries to take such steps as they thought necessary in the matter including appointment of an *ad hoc* committee, if it was considered desirable.

The Committee also considered the question of admitting to the Congress Legislature Parties persons who had worked against Congress candidates during the general elections and decided that the cases should be considered on individual merits.

The Committee considered the note in regard to the pending disputes and disciplinary action cases and authorised the Congress President to take necessary steps in the matter including the appointment of a committee for the purpose, if necessary.

The Committee reviewed the present position of the Central Relief Committee and also considered the question of recovering the loan of Rs. 150,000 given to the Central Relief Committee from the Punjab Relief Fund. It was pointed out that the Central Relief Committee had spent this amount and was not in a position to repay the loan. The Committee resolved that the sum of Rs. 150,000 be written off.

The Committee considered the resolution of the Working Committee dated the 12th June 1951 dealing with the question of the return of Rs. 51,111 presented in 1948 to the then Congress President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad and resolved that the sum of Rs. 51,111 be returned to the Vindhya Pradesh Government.

In February 1950 by a resolution the Working Committee appointed an Economic Planning Sub-Committee of the Congress. This Sub-Committee had raised certain funds from the various State Governments. Out of these funds a sum of Rs. 15,587-13-6 was still standing to its credit in the books of the AICC. As the work of this Sub-Committee was over the Working Committee resolved that the sum of Rs. 15,587-13-6 standing to the credit of the Economic Planning Sub-Committee in the accounts of the AICC be transferred to the general fund of the AICC.

Four shares of Hindustan Theatres Limited, Kuala Lumpur were presented to the All India Congress Committee in 1948. On the

suggestion of some members, the Committee resolved that the four shares of Hindustan Theatres Limited, Kuala Lumpur be sold off and the sale proceeds be credited to the accounts of the All India Congress Committee.

The Committee considered the letter from the Bihar Pradesh Congress Committee endorsing the request of the Saharsa District Congress Committee that the AICC donate its quota of the Primary Membership Fee from Saharsa district for that Committee's building, but regretted that the request could not be acceded to.

The Congress President informed the Committee about Shri Shankarrao Deo's resignation from the Working Committee.

The Committee considered the letter from the Mysore PCC dated the 19th May, 1952 requesting that they be exempted from the operation of the Calcutta AICC resolution regarding reconstitution of the DCC Executives, but rejected the request.

The Committee reviewed the position of Abu Congress Committee *vis-a-vis* Gujarat PCC and Rajasthan PCC. The Committee authorised the Congress President to take steps for the carrying out of the Congress work effectively in Abu, pending final decision about the position of Abu *vis-a-vis* Gujarat and Rajasthan.

The Committee considered the letter from the Bombay PCC dated the 28th April, 1952 suggesting that the name of the AICC be changed to Indian National Congress Committee. The Committee did not approve of the suggestion.

The Committee considered the question of a building for the AICC. It was decided that efforts be made to find a suitable site in New Delhi or its neighbourhood.

Dr. B.C. Roy informed the Committee that one Krishna Kumar Chatterjee had applied for the registration of an organisation to be called "The Indian National Congress". The Committee authorised Shri U.S. Malliah to take necessary steps in the matter.

The president placed before the Committee a proposal for the creation of a corp of efficient and good officers under the AICC who may be deputed to go round the various Pradesh Congress Committees, whenever required. He felt that there was great need of close coordination between the Headquarters and the PCCs and the creation of such a cadre was desirable. The Committee accepted this proposal.

The Congress President said that it was necessary for the Working Committee to take serious note of basic matters such as Economic

Policy, Five-Year Plan, Agrarian Reforms, etc. and invited a discussion. Members and invitees expressed their views on various aspects of the Economic Policy.

The Working Committee then adjourned to meet at 9 A.M. on the next day.

* * * *

The Working Committee had two sittings on Sunday, the 1st June, 1952 at the Prime Minister's residence under the presidentship of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. The first sitting started at 9 A.M. and the second at 3 P.M.

All the Working Committee members present at the previous day's meeting were present. Among the invitees Shri Satyanarain Sinha was not present in either of the sittings while Shri Hare Krishna Mahtab did not attend the evening sitting.

There was general discussion about the Economic Policy, Agrarian Reforms and the Five-Year Plan in which members freely participated.

The question of linguistic provinces was also discussed. Though no decision was taken the consensus of opinion was that the resolution of the Working Committee passed in August 1951 should be strictly adhered to.

The Committee then adjourned to meet at 3 P.M. on the next day.

* * * *

The Committee met again on Monday, the 2nd June 1952 at 3 P.M. in the Prime Minister's House under the presidentship of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. All members present in the previous two days' meetings with the exception of Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant attended. In addition Shri Morarji Desai was present.

Out of the invitees attending the meeting on the 31st May Shri Satyanarain Sinha, Shri Hare Krishna Mahtab, Shri Sampurnanand and Shri U.N. Dhebar were not present, while Shri S.K. Patil, Shri Srikrishna Sinha and Shri A.N. Sinha were present in addition to those invitees who attended the meeting on the 31st May.

The Working Committee by their resolution dated the 5th April 1949 had authorised a committee of five members to work up the formation of the Youth Organisation. In terms of that resolution a Youth Organisation was set up with a Central Youth Board incharge of the organisation. The Central Youth Board appointed Youth Boards in some provinces. At the initial stages the Central Youth Board and the

Youth Department of the AICC worked in close liaison but subsequent to the resignation of Shri Ravindra Verma, who was the General Secretary of the Central Youth Board and the Secretary of the Youth Department of the AICC, this close liaison ceased with the result that there was confusion. The whole question was considered by the Working Committee.

The Committee resolved that the Central Youth Board and the provincial Youth Boards be abolished and further resolved that a Youth Department should function under the AICC and that the PCCs be asked to organise Youth Organisations for constructive work under the guidance of the AICC.

After further discussion on the Economic Programme, Agrarian Reforms and the Five-Year Plan, the Committee resolved that a Committee of the members of the Working Committee residing in Delhi along with Dr. B.C. Roy, Pt. Govind Ballabh Pant and Shri Morarji Desai be appointed to discuss the Five-Year Plan before it was finalised. It was also decided that this Committee should meet on the 15th June 1952 at 9 A.M. in the Prime Minister's House.

The Working Committee fixed the 30th and 31st August 1952 for the AICC meeting at Indore.

The next meeting of the Working Committee was fixed for the 28th, 29th and if necessary, the 30th June 1952.

The Committee then adjourned.

Document No. 108

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

New Delhi, June 28 & 29, 1952

The Congress Working Committee met on Saturday, the 28th June, 1952 at 4 P.M. at Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's residence under his presidentship.

The following were present:

Messrs. Jawaharlal Nehru, Abul Kalam Azad, Purushottamdas Tandon, Govind Ballabh Pant, Morarji Desai, Gulzarilal Nanda, B.S. Hirey, Munnuswamy Pillai, Manikya Lal Verma, Sanjeeva Reddy, Kamaraj Nadar, Lal Bahadur Shastri and U.S. Malliah.

K.N. Katju, B.C. Roy, S. Nijalingappa, Jagjiwan Ram, Satyanarain Sinha, Hare Krishna Mahtab, S.K. Patil, Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, S.K. Sinha, Syed Mahmud, Khandubhai Desai, Govind Das, Atulya Ghosh, A.N. Sinha and U.N. Dhebar were present by special invitation.

Proceedings of the Working Committee meeting on the 31st May and the 1st and 2nd June 1952 were confirmed.

The Working Committee considered the request from the various Pradesh Congress Committees for extension of time for enrolment of primary members. It was decided that the last date for the enrolment of primary and active members be extended to the 31st August 1952.

The Working Committee had bifurcated the Kerala PCC into Malabar PCC and Travancore-Cochin PCC by their resolution dated the 31st May, 1952. In her letter Smt. A.V. Kuttimalu Amma had requested that the Malabar portion of the Kerala PCC be called Kerala PCC and the remaining portion Travancore-Cochin PCC. She had further suggested that if that was not acceptable, the Malabar portion be called Malayala PCC and its headquarters be located at Kozhikode. The Committee accordingly resolved that the Malabar portion of the old Kerala PCC be called as Malayala PCC and its headquarters be located at Kozhikode.

The Committee discussed the Land Reforms set out in the Five-Year Draft Plan published by the Planning Commission.

The Committee adjourned at 8 P.M. to meet at 9 A.M. on Sunday.

* * * *

The Working Committee had two sittings on Sunday, the 29th June, 1952 at the residence of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, who presided. The first sitting started at 9 A.M. and the second at 4 P.M.. All the members and the special invitees present in previous day's meeting except Shri Satyanarain Sinha, attended both the sittings.

There was a discussion regarding the Congress situation in Madhya Bharat, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh in particular and in the rest of the country in general.

After this the members of the Planning Commission, namely, Shri T.T. Krishnamachari, Shri G.L. Mehta, Shri C. D. Deshmukh, Shri R.K. Patil and Mrs. Durgabai joined the discussions. There was further consideration of the Land Reforms suggested in the Five-Year Draft Plan.

The members of the Planning Commission were also present in the afternoon meeting. There was discussion regarding the financial aspect of the Five-Year Draft Plan. The Committee also considered as to what should be the future financial policy.

The Congress President apprised the Committee of the latest developments regarding Kashmir. He also reviewed the present international situation.

The Working Committee appointed the following Election Sub-Committee for framing rules and regulations for the Congress elections:

Shri Jagjiwan Ram

Shri Amolak Chand

Shri H. Sitaram Reddy

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri — General Secretary

Shri Srinivasa Malliah

The Committee then adjourned *sine die*.

Document No. 109

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

New Delhi, August 10, 1952

The Working Committee met on Sunday, the 10th August, 1952 at 10 A.M. at Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's residence under his presidentship.

The second sitting started at 4 P.M.

The following were present: Messrs. Jawaharlal Nehru, Abul Kalam Azad, Purushottamdas Tandon, Govind Ballabh Pant, Nabakrishna Chaudhari, N.V. Gadgil, Ramanand Tirth, Manikya Lal Verma, S. Nijalingappa, Kamaraj Nadar, Pratap Singh Kairon, V.L. Munnuswami Pillai, N. Sanjeeva Reddy, U.S. Malliah and Balvantray Mehta.

Messrs. Jagjiwan Ram, Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, K.N. Katju, Gulzarilal Nanda, Lal Bahadur Shastri, Hare Krishna Mahtab, Atulya Ghosh, Satyanarain Sinha, Srikrishna Sinha, Tikaram Paliwal, Mishrilal Gangwal, R.K. Patil and Anugraha Narain Sinha were present as special invitees.

Shri Srikrishna Sinha and Shri Anugraha Narain Sinha were absent from the second sitting.

The proceedings of the Working Committee meetings held on the 28th and 29th June, 1952 were confirmed.

Pradesh Returning Officer

The Working Committee considered the following recommendation of the Election Sub-Committee:

The Election Sub-Committee recommends that the Working Committee should appoint a Pradesh Returning Officer for each Pradesh with power to appoint District Returning Officers for conducting elections.

It was suggested that the Working Committee and the AICC have inherent authority to depute special representatives for enquiry, assistance or supervision whenever it becomes necessary. It was, therefore, unnecessary to adopt this recommendation.

Hyderabad Representatives on the AICC

The Committee considered Swami Ramanand Tirth's letter dated

the 8th August 1952 regarding the representation of Hyderabad on the AICC.

The Committee decided that the general body of the Hyderabad *ad hoc* Pradesh Congress Committee should meet and elect its representatives to the AICC as provided in Article IX of the Congress Constitution.

Procedure Regarding By-Elections

The Committee considered the notes regarding the by-elections. The Committee laid down the following procedure for the selection of Congress candidates for by-elections:

Upper House: The Leader of the Congress Party in the State Legislature and the President or Presidents of the Pradesh Congress Committee or Committees concerned should make a joint recommendation to the Central Parliamentary Board for its approval.

Lower House: The Pradesh Election Committee in consultation with the Leader of the Congress Party in the State Legislature should make recommendations to the Central Parliamentary Board for its approval.

In cases of emergency the Congress President was authorised to give approval to the Congress candidates if it was not possible to place the recommendations before the Central Parliamentary Board.

The Committee decided that no applications be invited in future for elections to the seats in the legislatures and that recommendations be made as per procedure laid down above.

Amendments to the Congress Constitution

The Committee considered the recommendations of the Constitution Sub-committee regarding the amendments to the Congress constitution and decided upon certain changes.

Resolution on Land Reform

In the afternoon sitting the committee considered the notes of Shri Gulzarilal Nanda, Shri Tikaram Paliwal, Shri Hare Krishna Mahtab and Sardar Lal Singh, regarding land problem.

It was decided that a resolution regarding land reform be placed before the AICC at Indore in the light of the discussion that took place in the Working Committee.

INA Enquiry and Relief Fund

On October 15, 1951 the Working Committee appointed a Sub-

Committee consisting of the following for the INA Enquiry and Relief Fund:

Jawaharlal Nehru, Sri Prakasa, and Lal Bahadur Shastri.

Since Shri Sri Prakasa had become the Governor of Madras, the Sub-Committee was reconstituted as follows:

Jawaharlal Nehru, Lal Bahadur Shastri, Balvantray Mehta.

Collections from Vindhya Pradesh for Gandhi Smarak Nidhi

The Committee considered Shri G.V. Mavalankar's letter dated the 2nd August 1952 regarding the AICCs claim for Rs. 23,384-14-8 from Gandhi Nidhi Collections in Vindhya Pradesh.

The Committee authorised Shri N.V. Gadgil to settle the question with the Gandhi National Memorial Fund.

Time-table for the Meetings at Indore

The following programme was approved for the various meetings at Indore:

Working Committee	September	12, 1952-9.00 A.M.
Legislators' Convention	"	12, 1952-2.30 P.M.
Working Committee	"	13, 1952-morning
AICC	"	13, 1952-2.30 P.M.
	"	14, 1952

The Committee decided that resolutions on the following subjects may be placed before the AICC meeting at Indore in addition to the main work of considering the amendments to the Congress constitution:

Kashmir

Foreign Policy

South Africa

Land Reforms Policy

Tunisia

The Committee then adjourned *sine die*.

Document No. 110

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

Indore, September 12 & 13, 1952

The Congress Working Committee met on Friday the 12th September, 1952 at 10 A.M. at Daly College, Indore, under the presidentship of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. The following were present:

Messrs. Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Purushottamdas Tandon, Govind Ballabh Pant, Nabakrishna Choudhury, Morarji Desai, N.V. Gadgil, Ramanand Tirth, Manikya Lal Verma, S. Nijalingappa, Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon, V.I. Munnuswami Pillai, Khandubhai Desai, U.S. Malliah and Balvantray Mehta.

Those present by special invitation were:

Messrs. K.N. Katju, G.L. Nanda, Lal Bahadur Shastri, Jagjiwan Ram, B.S. Hirey, S.K. Sinha, A.N. Sinha, H.K. Mahtab, S.K. Patil, Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, Satyanarain Sinha and Sriman Narayan.

The proceedings of the Working Committee meeting held on the 10th August, 1952 were confirmed.

The Working Committee considered the various amendments received to the proposals of the Working Committee regarding the changes in the constitution of the Indian National Congress and suggested some modifications.

The Committee then considered draft resolutions on the following subjects:

Condolence

South Africa;

Foreign Policy; and

Tunisia

to be placed before the AICC.

The meeting then adjourned.

* * * *

The Working Committee again met on Saturday, the 13th September, 1952 at 9 A.M. in the Daly College under the presidentship of Shri

Jawaharlal Nehru, Shri Kamaraj Nadar and Shri N. Sanjeeva Reddy were present besides those members who were present in the previous day's meeting. Except Shri S.K. Sinha all the invitees, who attended the previous day's meeting, were present.

The President informed the Committee about the Congress affairs in Bihar and about the report he had received from Shri S.N. Agarwal, who had been deputed by him to go to Bihar for enquiry.

The Committee authorised the President to take such steps as he thought best on Shri Agarwal's report on Bihar affairs.

The Committee considered the question of Congress lawyers appearing in election cases against the Congress candidates. The question was generally discussed but no decision was taken.

The Committee considered the note regarding disciplinary action cases. The note was approved.

The Committee discussed the question of appointment of paid parliamentary secretaries. The consensus of opinion was that as far as possible no paid parliamentary secretaries should be appointed.

The following decisions were taken regarding the official resolutions:

South Africa—Proposer	...	Pt. Govind Ballabh Pant
Second	...	Shri Morarji Desai
Foreign Policy—Proposer	...	Maulana Abul Kalam Azad
Second	...	Shri S.K. Patil
Constitutional Amend-		
ments—Proposer	...	Shri N.V. Gadgil
Tunisia —	...	From the Chair

The President then read out his own draft for a resolution on Economic Policy. He also read out a draft by Shri Gulzarilal Nanda which was proposed to be added to his draft. These two drafts were considered and it was then decided that a fresh draft be prepared in the light of the discussion.

The Committee considered the non-official resolution regarding "Ceiling on Salaries", "Changes in the Indian Union Constitution" and "Abolition of Rajpramukhs and their Privy Purses". It was decided that statements may be made after these resolutions have been moved and the movers be asked not to press these resolutions.

The Committee considered the question of the revival of "Congress Sandesh". The Congress President said that he was in favour of having

a journal but on condition that the loss did not come to more than Rs. 1,000 per month. This sum too should be equally shared between the Congress Party and the AICC.

The following Sub-Committee was appointed to look into the matter and submit its report:

N.V. Gadgil,
Lal Bahadur Shastri,
B. Shiva Rao,
U.S. Malliah, and
Balwantrai Mehta

The Committee then adjourned.

* * * *

The Working Committee met again on Saturday, the 13th September in the Daly College at Indore at 9.30 P.M. under the presidentship of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. Among the members Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Shri Purushottamdas Tandon and Shri Manikya Lal Verma were not present. The following special invitees were present:

K.N. Katju, G.L. Nanda, Lal Bahadur Shastri, S.K. Patil, Jagjiwan Ram, S.K. Sinha, H.K. Mahtab and S.N. Agarwal.

The Committee decided to send a Christmas gift of £ 100 from the INA Relief and Enquiry Fund to Smt. Subhash Chandra Bose.

The Committee decided that efforts should be made to purchase a land for the AICC building at concessional rates.

The draft resolution on "Economic Policy" was considered and adopted for being placed before the AICC.

It was decided that Shri N.V. Gadgil should move the resolution and Shri Sriman Narayan Agarwal should second it.

The following Sub-Committee was formed to discuss the final draft of the Five-Year Plan with the Planning Commission on the 6th October, 1952.

Members of the CWC present in Delhi, and
Govind Ballabh Pant
N.V. Gadgil
Morarji Desai
Khandubhai Desai
U.N. Dhebar
Nabakrishna Choudhary
Lal Bahadur Shastri

The Committee considered Shri S.K. Patil's statement regarding multi-point sales-tax. Shri Patil placed his side of the picture before the Committee. The president also made some observations with regard to this matter.

The Committee then adjourned *sine die*.

Document No. 111

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

New Delhi, November 9, 1952

The Working Committee met on Sunday, the 9th November, 1952 at the residence of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru under his presidentship. There were two sittings, one at 9 A.M. and the other at 6 P.M.

The following members attended: Messrs. Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Purushottamdas Tandon, Govind Ballabh Pant, Morarji Desai, Lal Bahadur Shastri, Nabakrishna Chowdhury, Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, Manikya Lal Verma, N. Sanjeeva Reddy, Kamraj Nadar, Smt. Pushpavati Mehta, Pratap Singh Kairon, Swami Ramanand Tirth, N.V. Gadgil, S. Nijalingappa, U.S. Malliah, Balvantray Mehta and S.N. Agarwal.

The following persons were present by special invitation: Messrs. B.C. Roy, Jagiwan Ram, Satyanarain Sinha, Gulzarilal Nanda, Srikrishna Sinha, K.N. Katju and B.S. Hirey.

The minutes of the Indore meeting of the Working Committee were confirmed.

Programme for Hyderabad Session

The following programme was approved for the Hyderabad Congress Session:

Working Committee —	Wednesday and Thursday, the 14th and the 15th January, 1953.
Subjects Committee —	Thursday and Friday, the 15th and the 16th January, 1953.
Open Session —	Saturday and Sunday, the 17th and the 18th and, if necessary, Monday, the 19th January, 1953.

Duplicate Delegates

The Working Committee considered the note regarding duplicate delegates being elected from Singhbhum in Bihar and Utkal Pradeshes,

and from Hosdurg Sub-Taluq in South Kanara District in Malayala and Karnataka Pradeshes.

It was pointed out that duplicate delegates were being returned in Koraput and Berhampore districts also.

The Committee also considered its resolution dated the 2nd July 1948 which runs as follows:

The Working Committee considered the question of jurisdiction of certain PCCs in areas outside the administrative and governmental boundaries of their provinces. It was of the opinion that the boundaries of the Congress provinces should be co-terminus with the boundaries of the administrative governmental boundaries.

The Committee felt that the above decision gave a broad outline of the principles to be followed in such cases.

The Committee thought that if the Pradesh Congress Committee concerned could decide between themselves about such areas then it could be implemented. Otherwise, for the sake of convenience the administrative units should be taken as the basis for returning delegates from such areas. It was also decided that the laying down of the above principle should not be considered as a bar for a fuller consideration of the problem at a later date.

Election Tribunal Rules

The Working Committee approved the Election Tribunal Rules framed under Article XXIV and XXV of the Congress constitution.

Amendment in the Indian Constitution

The Committee considered Shri Hirey's letter suggesting an amendment in Article XXXI of the Indian Constitution. The Committee thought that there was some force in Shri Hirey's suggested amendment and it was decided that the point might be examined fully by the Government as well as by the AICC office.

Primary Membership Conditions

The Committee considered a letter in which clarification from the Committee was sought regarding primary Congress members enrolled in areas where they were neither residents nor carried on business. The Committee saw no reason to make any change in Article IV (a) of the Congress constitution defining primary membership conditions.

Sathi Lands

The Committee considered the note about Sathi lands. The Committee resolved to appoint a Committee consisting of Shri Morarji Desai, Dr. K.N. Katju and Shri Nabakrishna Chowdhary to look into the matter and report to the President.

Next Meeting of the Working Committee

It was decided that the next meeting of the Working Committee should be held on the 30th and 31st December, 1952.

Bihar Congress Affairs

The Committee considered the note regarding Bihar Congress organisational matters. Shri Ghanashyam Singh Gupta's interim report was also read out. The Committee also heard Shri Ramlakhan Singh, Secretary, Bihar Pradesh Committee. The following decision was taken:

The working Committee considered Shri Ghanshyam Singh Gupta's report. It also heard the Secretary, Bihar PCC, Shri Ramlakhan Singh. In view of this report and other information received, a strong suspicion arises that considerable number of bogus members have been enrolled. As elections are actually taking place in Bihar now and no action can be taken without further enquiry those elections should be allowed to proceed. It must be clearly understood that if subsequent enquiry discloses in any area that bogus members have been enrolled or other irregularities committed, further action will be taken. Such enquiry should be arranged as early as convenient in selected areas of Bihar.

Meanwhile all the moneys realised as membership dues in Bihar should be immediately remitted to the AICC. Moneys with the PCC should be remitted immediately. The money, with the DCC should be remitted through the PCC or directly to the AICC. Moneys with subordinate committees should be remitted by the 22nd November at the latest. The PCC may retain Rs. 20,000 (Rupees twenty thousand) for current expenses.

West Bengal Pradesh Congress Tribunal

The Working Committee appoints the following three persons to be members of the West Bengal Pradesh Election Tribunal:

Aparesh Bhattacharya

Nut Behari Datta

Shambu Charan Mukerjee

Reconstruction of Election Sub-Committee

The Working Committee considered the note regarding the reconstruction of the Election Sub-Committee appointed by the Working Committee on the 12th June, 1952 and took the following decision:

Resolved that an election Sub-Committee as under be formed to supervise and control elections for the delegates, etc. all over the country:

Jaggiwan Ram
Lal Bahadur Shastri
U.S. Malliah
S.N. Agarwal
D.K. Barooah
Amolak Chand
Balwantray Mehta

Extension of time for Enrolment of Primary Members

The Working Committee considered the Bombay Pradesh Congress Committee's request for extension of the date for enrolment of the Congress members for legislators who had been given associate membership rights at the Indore meeting of the AICC after the Congress members' enrolment dates were over. The Committee decided that there was no point in extending the date of Congress members' enrolment especially for the legislators.

A note was circulated amongst the Working Committee members regarding the replies received from the Presidents of the Pradesh Congress Committees and the Chief Ministers in connection with the question of co-ordination between the organisation and the Government.

The consensus of opinion was that this relationship will have to be evolved through conventions. Already some such conventions existed in several states. These conventions should be developed on healthy lines. Members were also of the opinion that arrangements should be made for periodic meetings between the Ministers and the PCC authorities.

The Committee then adjourned *sine die*.

Document No. 112

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

8-13 February, 1956

SHAHEEDNAGAR, AMRITSAR

The Working Committee met on Wednesday, February 8, 1956 at 9 A.M. in the President's Camp, Shahcednagar, Amritsar. Shri U.N. Dhebar presided.

The following members were present: Messrs. U.N. Dhebar, Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalan. Azad, Govind Ballabh Pant, Morarji Desai, Smt. Indira Gandhi, A.V. Kutimalu Amma, Balvantray Mehta, T.R. Deogirakar, Mahendra Mohan Choudhury, Janab Hafiz Mohd. Ibrahim, B.C. Roy, Giani Gurmukh Singh Musafir, Jagjiwan Ram, S.K. Sinha, Kamraj Nadar, Nabakrushna Choudhury, Sriman Narayan and K.P. Madhavan Nair.

Khandubhai Desai, Lal Bahadur Shastri, S.K. Patil, Gulzarilal Nanda, Bhimsen Sachar, Syed Mahmud, K.N. Katju, G.D. Ambedkar, Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon and U.S. Malliah were present by special invitation.

1. The minutes of the last Working Committee meetings held on January 22 and 23, 1956 were confirmed.

2. The Committee considered the Auditor's Note on the accounts of the AICC for the period ended December 15, 1955. The following decisions were taken:

- (i) The information about the Calcutta Corporation Loan and the Bombay Municipal Loan was noted;
- (ii) It was decided that account for the advances standing against the names of the Pradesh Congress Committees in the Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel National Memorial Fund should be cleared as early as possible by requesting the PCCs to send the accounts;
- (iii) Steps should be taken to deposit the employees' provident fund in Treasury Deposit Saving Certificates as suggested by the Auditors; and

- (iv) Expense of Rs. 1509/12/- against Motor Car recurring expenses and Rs. 571/13/6 against salaries spent in excess of budgetary provision be sanctioned.

The president suggested that the amount of Rs. 10,000/- standing as advance against the Delhi PCC should be written off, because the financial position of the PCC was not good and they were not in a position to repay the debt. The PCC had to suffer a severe loss due to fire that took place at that time. The suggestion was approved and a formal proposal may be brought.

The President brought to the attention of the Committee that the accounts of the Avadi Session have not been submitted. He suggested that in the AICC accounts the credit and debit of the Reception Committee account should be shown in future. This suggestion was approved.

3. The Committee considered the Maharashtra PCC resolution dated January 28, 1956. The President was authorised to inform the Maharashtra PCC that the last resolution of the Working Committee stands and there is no question of any reconsideration.

4. Draft resolution on International Affairs was considered. Certain changes were suggested. It was decided that the draft be placed before the Committee at the afternoon session after incorporating the suggestions made.

5. There was a general discussion regarding the points to be incorporated in the resolution regarding the Second Five Year Plan.

6. It was decided that resolutions regarding the SRC Report and organisational matters be drafted and placed before the Committee. It was also decided that a short resolution about Buddha Jayanthi be drafted and placed before the Committee.

7. The President informed the Committee that 41 out of the 45 nominations of the AICC had already been made.

The Working Committee again met at 3 P.M.. In addition to the members present in the morning, Shri Adityendra attended the meeting. Among the invitees Sardar Partap Singh Kairon was not present.

The draft resolutions on International Affairs and the Message of the Buddha were considered and were adopted.

The Working Committee considered the non-official resolutions.

The draft resolution on the Second Five-Year Plan was considered. It was decided to re-draft the resolution and place it before the Committee at the next meeting.

The Working Committee took note of the General Secretaries

Report for the year 1955.

The Committee adjourned at 5.30 P.M.

* * * *

The Working Committee met on Thursday, February 9, at 9 A.M. in the President's Camp. Shri U.N. Dhebar presided. All the members except Shri Govind Ballabh Pant were present. Seth Govind Das attended besides those present in the previous day's morning meeting.

The draft resolution on Economic Policy and Five-Year Plan and call for saving were considered and adopted.

The proposed constitutional amendment regarding Article IV(c) was considered. It was decided that the following words be added at the end of the proposed Article:

“or shall contribute annually 25 gundis of self-spun yarn of at least 16 counts.”

In this connection it was also decided that Shri Bijay Singh's amendment for adding the word “new” before “primary members” was unnecessary. Dr. Yudhvir Singh's amendment was covered. The third amendment of Shri Banwarilal Chhakkhar was to be opposed.

It was suggested that the formal resolution endorsing the resolution of the Working Committee dated January 23 be adopted regarding the Reorganisation of States. A draft should be considered at the next meetings of the Working Committee.

The following proposers and seconders were decided:

Condolence

From the Chair

, The Message of the Buddha

Proposer: Shri Jawaharlal Nehru

Seconders: Seth Govind Das

Economic Policy and

Proposer: Shri Gulzarilal Nanda

Five-Year Plan

Seconders: Shri Jagjiwan Ram

Call for Saving

Proposer: Shri S.K. Patil

Seconders: Shri Mahendra Mohan Choudhury

Smt. Indira Gandhi

Shri C. Subramaniam

Reorganisation of States

Proposer: Maulana Abul

Kalam Azad

Seconders: Shri Govind Ballabh Pant

Giani Gurmukh Singh
Musafir

Organisational Affairs

Proposer: Shri Lal Bahadur
Shastri

Seconder: Shri Sriman Narayan

The Committee adjourned at 11.30 A.M. to meet at 8.30 A.M. the next day.

* * * *

The Working Committee met on Friday, February 10 at 8.30 A.M. in the President's Camps. Shri Dhebar presided.

All the members except Dr. S.K. Sinha attended. Among the 11 invitees Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon was not present. Shri C. Subramaniam was also invited to attend the sitting.

The draft resolution on Reorganisation of States was considered. The discussion had not concluded when the Committee rose at 9.30 A.M. to meet at 12 A.M.

* * * *

The Working Committee met at 12 noon. All the 20 members, and the invitees, except Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon, were present.

The resolution regarding the Reorganisation of States was finalised.

The resolution on Organisational Affairs was finalised by a committee consisting of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, Shri Jagjiwan Ram, Shri Morarji Desai and Smt. Indira Gandhi.

The Committee adjourned at 1.30 P.M.

Note : The Congress President, Shri Sriman Narayan and Shri Gulzarilal Nanda were not present in the Committee from 12 to 1 P.M. as they were busy with the meeting of the Subjects Committee.

* * * *

The Working Committee met on Monday, February 13, at 8.30 A.M. at the Circuit House, Amritsar, under the presidentship of Shri Dhebar. All the members except Shri Nabakrushna Choudhury were present. Shri S.K. Patil, Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon and Shri G.L. Nanda were present by special invitation.

On behalf of the Working Committee Dr. B.C. Roy thanked the Chairman of the Reception Committee, Giani Gurmukh Singh Musafir and the Chief Minister, Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon, for the good arrangements they had made for the Congress Session. Maulana Abul

Kalam Azad associated himself with the sentiments expressed by Dr. P.C. Roy.

The Committee then considered the resolutions adopted by the Annual Session. The following decisions were taken:

(a) In order to consider the resolution "Call for Saving" and to formulate schemes for its implementation, the under-mentioned persons will form a Sub-Committee, with power to co-opt, and they will submit their preliminary report at the next meeting of the Working Committee:

Govind Ballabh Pant, Gulzarilal Nanda, Jagjivan Ram, Smt. Indira Gandhi, Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon, Gurmukh Singh Musafir, S.K. Patil and Sriman Narayan (Convener).

(b) The under-mentioned persons will form a Sub-Committee to prepare a detailed scheme for the training of Congress workers:

Jawaharlal Nehru

Jagjivan Ram

Gulzarilal Nanda

Lal Bahadur Shastri

Nabakrushna Choudhary

Smt. Indira Gandhi

Balvantray Mehta

K.P. Madhavan Nair (Convener)

It was resolved to hold the next meeting of the Working Committee on April 15 and 16, 1956 in New Delhi.

The Committee was apprised of the talks the members of the Government of India SRC Sub-Committee had with the Akali leaders.

The Committee also discussed the future of Telengana and decided that the Residuary State of Hyderabad should be integrated with Andhra and a provision for a Regional Council could be made for Telengana as visualised for the Punjab. It was further decided that the leaders of Telengana be invited to discuss this with the Sub-Committee. The Committee believed that the problem of Vishalandhra could thus be settled by mutual agreement.

The Committee then discussed the venue and date of the next meeting of the AICC and also the venue and date of the next Annual Session of the Congress.

It was decided that the next meeting of the AICC be held at Bombay

on June 2 and 3, 1956 and that a meeting of the Working Committee be held there on June 1, 1956.

It was decided to accept the invitation of the Madhya Bharat PCC for holding the next Congress Session there some time in January 1957.

The Committee adjourned at 10.30 A.M.

Document No. 113

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

New Delhi, April 15, 1956

The Working Committee met on Sunday, April 15, 1956 at 9 A.M. at 1, Roberts Road. Shri U.N. Dhebar presided.

The Following were present: Messrs. U.N. Dhebar, Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Govind Ballabh Pant, B.C. Roy, Nabakrishna Choudhary, K. Kamaraj Nadar, Morarji Desai, Smt. Indira Gandhi, T.R. Deogirakar, Sri Krishna Sinha, Hafiz Mohd. Ibrahim, Mahendra Mohan Choudhury, Balvantray Mehta, Jagjiwan Ram, Giani Gurmukh Singh Musafir, Smt. A.V.Kuttimalu Amma, Adityendra, Sriman Narayan, and K.P. Madhavan Nair.

Dr. K.N. Katju, Lal Bahadur Shastri, Gulzarilal Nanda, Khandubhai Desai, U.S. Malliah, D.K. Borooah, S.K. Patil, G.D. Ambedkar were present as invitees.

The minutes of the meetings of the Working Committee held at Amritsar in February 1956 were confirmed.

The Working Committee considered the recommendations of the Constitution Sub-Committee and resolved to place before the next meeting of the All India Congress Committee, for its acceptance, the following amendments to the constitution:

(I) In article II (iv) delete the note and re-write the clause, adding after the words "Congress Committee" the following:

"but in a city with a population of more than 10 lakhs there can be more than one District Congress committee."

(II) In the Article II (v) omit the words in brackets:

"There shall be a Mandal (or Taluqa) Congress Committee which shall approximate to a delegate constituency as provided in Article VIII (b)."

(III) Article IV: Delete clause (iv) of sub-clause (a) of Article IV.

(IV) In clause (b) of Article IV insert the following words between "an Active Member" and "on payment" only after he has been on the roll of Primary Members for two consecutive years."

(V) add the following as clause (d) of Article IV:

“Active membership shall be continuous so long as the annual subscription is paid according to rules made thereunder and other conditions prescribed.”

(VI) Re-name clause (d) of Article IV as clause (e).

(VII) Delete the first sentence in clause (a) of Article VI and substitute the following:

“Permanent register of Active Members shall be maintained by PCCs and DCCs.”

(VIII) Delete clause (b) of Article VII and substitute the following:

“Only an Active Member whose name is in the register of Active Members shall be eligible for election as a delegate or as a member of any Congress Committee above a Mandal (or Taluqa) Congress Committee, provided, however, office-bearers and members of the Executive Committee of Mandal (or Taluqa) Congress Committee shall also be Active Members.”

(IX) In clause (d) of Article XII add the following sentence at the end:

“In case the nomination cannot be made unanimously, representatives shall be elected on the basis of proportional representation by single transferable vote.”

(X) In sub-clause (v) of clause (f) of Article XX substitute (iv) (b) for (iv) (a) (iv).

(XI) Add the following new clause (h) in Article XX:

“To appoint a Board of Trustees for holding properties belonging to the All India Congress Committee. The term of the Board shall be for three years and the Treasurer of the All India Congress Committee shall be an *ex-officio* member of the Board.”

(XII) Re-name clause (h) of Article XX as clause (i) (B). The Working Committee also decided that

(i) Article I be amended by adding the word “Socialist” before the words “Cooperative Commonwealth,” so that the amended Article might read as follows:

“The object of the Indian National Congress is the well-being and advancement of the people of India and the establishment in India, by peaceful and legitimate means, of a Socialist Cooperative Commonwealth based on equality of opportunity and of political, economic

and social rights and aiming at world peace and fellowship.”

- (ii) Under Article III the territorial jurisdiction of Pradesh Congress Committees be changed at the time of the reorganisation of States.
- (iii) Pradesh Congress Committees be directed to appoint a Board of Trustees for holding Congress properties according to rules to be prescribed in that behalf by the Executive of the Pradesh Congress Committees.
- (iv) All Congress elections due in 1956 be put off till after the General Elections.

The Committee considered the preliminary report of the Small Savings Sub-Committee and accepted the recommendation for requesting the Central Advisory Committee for small savings to launch a drive for the purpose. The Committee authorised Shri Govind Ballabh Pant to have discussions with the Finance Minister on its behalf to urge for a campaign for small savings.

The final report of the Small Savings Sub-Committee should be considered at the next meeting of the Working Committee.

The Committee considered the report of the Congress Workers Training Sub-Committee and generally approved it.

The Committee considered the AICC budget for the period 16th December, 1955 to 15th December, 1956. It approved a sum of Rs. 6 lakhs for budget expenses during the year, including the sum of Rs. 1 lakh sanctioned by the Working Committee for expenses in January, February and March 1956.

The Committee considered the office note regarding the purchase of the present premises of the AICC Office (7, Jantar Mantar Road). The Committee approved the idea of purchasing the premises and authorised the Treasurer to take suitable steps in the matter and execute necessary documents.

The Committee considered the office note regarding insurance agents. The Committee decided that insurance agency held on commission basis by M.Ps and M.L.As should not be regarded as an office of profit.

The Committee considered the office note regarding exhibitions during Congress Sessions. It was decided that the matter be placed at the next meeting of the Committee after discussions with the Chairman of the All India Khadi and Village Industries Board.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru gave a review of the international situation.

He suggested that Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, who had just returned from the United Nations, be invited in the afternoon session to give his impressions about international affairs. The Committee adjourned at 1 P.M. to meet again at 3 P.M.

The Working Committee reassembled at 3 P.M. All the members, except Shri Hafiz Mohd. Ibrahim, were present. Among the invitees present in the morning session, Shri Gulzarilal Nanda and Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri were absent. Shri V. K. Krishna Menon and Dr. B.V. Keskar attended the meeting by special invitation.

The Committee considered the Memorandum of the Film Federation of India together with the views expressed by the Minister for Information and Broadcasting in his letters of January 19 and March 28.

The Committee felt that notwithstanding the legal difficulties, steps should be taken to enforce stricter censorship on undesirable films, both Indian and foreign. There was also consensus of opinion that arrangement should be made to censor films at the script stage in order to avoid later complications.

The Committee heard a review by Shri V.K. Krishna Menon of the present international situation. He specially touched upon the conditions in North Africa, Middle East, and the dispute between Arab countries and Israel. He also referred to the Disarmament Conference which is going on in London.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru also apprised the Committee of the Indo-Pakistan relations, the situation in regard to Kashmir and the results of elections in Ceylon.

The Committee considered the bye-election results. It was pointed out that the results showed the deteriorating position of organisation in Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh. There was general discussion on the conditions and political situation in the difference States and particularly in Travancore-Cochin, Rajasthan and Orissa. The Congress President emphasised the need for greater and more wholesome coordination between the Pradesh Congress Committee and the State Governments. He wanted that the procedure laid down by the joint conference of the PCC President and leaders of Congress Legislature Parties should be followed.

The Congress President also drew the attention of the Committee to the increase in the prices of foodgrains, etc.

Shri Adityendra informed the Committee about the efforts made for forging unity among the various groups in Rajasthan. He said that

people had decided to abide by any decisions which may be made by Panditji, the Congress President or Pantji. He also analysed the cause of the recent defeat of a Congress candidates in the election to Rajya Sabha from Rajasthan.

It was decided to hold the next meeting of the Working Committee at Bombay on June 1, before the meetings of the AICC scheduled for the 2nd and 3rd June, 1956.

The Committee adjourned at 6 P.M.

Document No. 114

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

Bombay, June 1 & 2, 1956

The Working Committee met on Friday, June 1, 1956 at 10 A.M. at Shri Morarji Desai's residence in Bombay. Shri U.N. Dhebar presided.

The following members and special invitees were present: Messrs. U.N. Dhebar, Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, G.B. Pant, B.C. Roy, Balvantray Mehta, Nabakrishna Choudhury, Giani Gurmukh Singh Musafir, Smt. A.V. Kuttimalu Amma, Smt. Indira Gandhi, Morarji Desai, K. Kamaraj Nadar, S.K. Sinha, Jagjiwan Ram, T.R. Dogirikar, Sriman Narayan and K.P. Madhavan Nair.

K.N. Katju, Syed Mahmud, Khandubhai Desai, G.D. Ambedkar, G.L. Nanda, S.K. Patil, V.K. Krishna Menon, U.S. Malliah and D.K. Borooah were present by invitation.

The minutes of the last meeting of the Working Committee held on April 15, 1956 were confirmed. Mention was also made about the informal meeting of Working Committee members and special invitees present in Delhi on May 26 and 27, 1956.

The Committee considered various amendments received from the members regarding the constitutional amendments suggested by the Working Committee. It was decided that the following suggestion of Shri Hemraj, Punjab, be incorporated in the rules:

In article VII (b) after the words "Active Members" add "whose names appear on the list of Active members on the 31st December of the year preceding the election."

The Committee also decided that the following suggestion of Shri Kailash Prakash, U.P. be placed before the House for its consideration:

In present clause (c) of Article X, add the words "or from which he has been elected" after the words "he resides".

It was decided that in Article XII (d) it should be provided that if nominations of representatives by the General Bodies of DCCs and PCCs cannot be made by a majority of two-third members present and voting then the nomination of such representatives should be made by

election on the basis of proportionate representation by the system of Single Transferable Vote. In the proposed amendment, it was suggested that nomination by election on the basis of proportionate representation by the system of Single Transferable Vote be adopted, if the nominations could not be made unanimously.

It was decided that all other amendments should be opposed.

The Committee considered the draft resolutions on international affairs. Treaty of Cession of French Settlements and Portuguese Possessions in India were adopted.

The Committee adopted the following resolution regarding Small Savings:

“The vital role of small savings in financing national development was emphasised by the Congress at the Amritsar Session in a resolution entitled “Call for Saving”. Immediately after the Amritsar Session, the Working Committee appointed a Sub-Committee to go into the question thoroughly and suggest methods by which the Small-Savings Drive could be made more effective and fruitful. In its Report, the Sub-Committee has suggested suitable methods for stimulating and mobilising voluntary savings. The Working Committee generally approves the recommendations of the Sub-Committee and urges on the Government and the people to conduct the Small Savings Campaign on a nation-wide basis.”

The Committee then took up the consideration of non-official resolutions:

(i) The first resolution of Shri D. Hazarika, Assam read as follows:

“This meeting of the All India Congress Committee recommends to the Government of India that in order to build up a healthy and a casteless society and for removal of untouchability in the country early steps should be taken for enacting suitable legislation for abolition of caste system.”

The Committee decided that the resolution be allowed to be discussed by the AICC. Later it should be pointed out that it would not be possible to adopt any legal measures in the matter.

(ii) The second non-official resolution given notice by Shri Prakash Chand Sethi read as follows:

“After formation of new States there should be one Pradesh Congress Committee for one unilingual State. If at all necessary, present *status quo* be maintained till the next General Elections.”

There was general discussion about the integration of PCCs as a result of States Reorganisation. Almost all the members expressed their views. The consensus of opinion was that there should be one Pradesh Congress Committee for each reorganised State. It was, however, suggested that the Executive Committees of the merged States may be amalgamated to form one Executive Committee and this Executive Committee may, if they so desire, elect a smaller Coordinating Committee for guiding day-to-day work. It was also suggested that if for any area it was necessary to have some regional committee, it may be allowed to have such a committee under the jurisdiction of the PCC. The President for the full PCC would be elected by all the members of the existing PCCs, and Presidents of other merging PCCs would be Vice-Presidents of the integrated PCC. The Vice-Presidents would be Presidents of their Regional Committees respectively.

The Committee considered the question of the Pradesh Election Committees. The discussion had not completed when the Committee adjourned at 12.45 P.M., to meet again at 3.30 P.M.

The Working Committee met at 3.30 P.M. at Shri Morarji Desai's residence. In addition to the members and invitees present in the morning sitting, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri attended. Shri G.M. Sadiq also attended the meeting for some time.

There was further discussion regarding the integration of PCCs as a result of States Reorganisation. It was suggested that the integrated PCCs should be allowed to retain their separate entity for some time. No decision was taken in the matter.

The Committee resumed consideration of the non-official resolutions.

The third non-official resolution regarding lepers was to be opposed; the fourth regarding ceiling to be allowed to be discussed; the fifth about communal activities also to be discussed; the sixth was likely to be covered by the official resolution.

The draft resolution on Condemnation of Violence was considered and adopted.

The Committee considered the draft resolution on the Second Five Year Plan. It was decided that two more paragraphs be added to the resolution and the amended draft be considered at the next meeting.

The Committee was of opinion that the following resolution regarding the Industrial Policy be placed before the AICC:

“The All India Congress Committee takes note of the resolution of the Government of India in regard to Industrial Policy and accords its general approval.”

The Committee then adjourned to meet at 9 A.M. the next day.

* * * *

The Working Committee met on Sunday, June 2, 1956, at 9 A.M. at Shri Morarji Desai's residence. Attendance was the same as in the previous day's afternoon sitting. Shri U.N. Dhebar presided.

The draft resolution regarding Safeguards for Linguistic Minorities was considered. It was adopted.

The amended resolution on the Second Five-Year Plan was adopted.

The following order was fixed for the resolutions to be placed before the AICC:

- 1. Condolence**
- 2. International Affairs**
- 3. Treaty of Cession of French Settlements**
- 4. Portuguese Possessions in India**
- 5. Second Five-Year Plan**
- 6. Industrial Policy**
- 7. Safeguards for Linguistic Minorities**
- 8. Condemnation of Violence**
- 9. Constitutional Amendments**

The following transitional arrangements were generally approved for the integration of PCCs and PECs till the next election of delegates:

- A. 1. One Pradesh Congress Committee for each State, consisting of all the members of the existing PCCs within that State.**
 - 2. The President for the composite PCC to be elected by the present members.**
 - 3. The present Presidents of the PCCs to be Vice-Presidents of the new PCCs and the Executives to consist of all the members of the present PCC Executives, but wherever necessary, a smaller Coordinating Committee can also be appointed.**
 - 4. The existing PCCs to function as Regional Committees with the present Presidents and Executives.**
- B. 1. The present Pradesh Election Committees to be responsible**

for recommending candidates to the Central Election Committee. But before submitting the recommendation the members of the present Pradesh Election Committees from the new State will sit together, exchange views, and the newly-elected President of the State-Committee will forward the recommendations.

The Committee considered the office note regarding Ganga Hari Fund. It was decided that the President should take necessary steps about the Fund.

The office note regarding Rajasthan affairs was considered. The Congress President suggested that he would like a senior member of the Working Committee to go into the question of Rajasthan and be in-charge of Rajasthan PCC. He added that the gentleman should try to bring round the groups together and submit his report within two or three weeks.

The Committee decided to appoint Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri for the purpose.

The Congress President informed the Committee that Shri Mahendra Mohan Choudhury was being appointed as the third General Secretary of the AICC.

The Committee adjourned at 11.15 A.M.

Document No. 115

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

New Delhi, August 5, 1956

The Working Committee met on Sunday the 5th August, 1956, at 9 A.M. at Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's residence. Shri U.N. Dhebar presided.

The following members and special invitees were present: Messrs. U.N. Dhebar, Jawaharlal Nehru, Abul Kalam Azad, Govind Ballabh Pant, Morarji Desai, B.C. Roy, S.K. Sinha, Jagjiwan Ram, Smt. A.V. Kuttimalu Amma, Smt. Indira Gandhi, Adityendra, Gurmukh Singh Musafir, Balvantray Mehta, Mohd. Ibrahim, T.R. Deogirikar, K. Kamaraj Nadar, Shriman Narayan, K.P. Madhavan Nair and M. Mohan Chaudhury

Messrs. Lal Bahadur Shastri, K.N. Katju, Gulzarilal Nanda, Khandubhai Desai, Syed Mahmud, S.K. Patil, U.S. Malliah and V.K. Krishna Menon were present by invitation.

The minutes of the last meeting of the Working Committee held at Bombay on 1st and 2nd June, 1956, were confirmed.

(a) It was decided that the next meeting of the All India Congress Committee be held at Calcutta in October, 1956. The following programme was also fixed:

Working Committee	26th October, 1956
AICC	27th, 28th and if necessary 29th October, 1956 also.

(b) It was decided to hold the next Annual Session of the Congress at Indore as per the following programme:

Working Committee	2nd January, 1957 and forenoon of 3rd January, 1957.
Subjects Committee	3rd (afternoon) and 4th and 5th January, 1957.
Open Session	6th and 7th January, 1957.

The Office note about the desirability of appointing an All India Relief Committee was considered. The Congress President was authorised to frame the constitution for the Committee and to prepare other details for consideration at the next meeting of the Working Committee.

Next Elections

The note about the arrangement for the General Elections was considered. The Congress President pointed out that the work was proceeding according to plan in some Pradeshes; but there were difficulties where fresh delimitation of constituencies has to take place in view of the Reorganisation of States.

The Congress President informed the Committee that there were applications from a number of people requesting for readmission into the Congress. It was decided that each application may be considered on its individual merits.

Caste System

(a) The Committee considered the following non-official resolution about the abolition of Caste System received for consideration of the AICC meeting at Bombay:

“This meeting of the All India Congress Committee recommends to the Government of India that in order to build up a healthy and a casteless society and for removal of untouchability in the country early steps should be taken for enacting suitable legislation for abolition of caste system.” This was referred to the Working Committee by the AICC.

The Committee was of the opinion that no legislation was possible in this connection but that the Government be requested to discourage consideration of caste in Census, in educational institutions, in Government offices and when selecting candidates for appointment by the Public Services Commission.

Communal Activities

(b) The Committee also considered the following resolution referred to it by the AICC:

“The AICC express its concern over the growing communal activities in the country and is of the emphatic opinion that communal feelings are detrimental to the growth of free India. The AICC enjoins upon all Congressmen not to take any part directly or indirectly in any communal organisation or institution and to fight such tendencies in our social life.”

The Committee was of the opinion that no action was called for on the above resolution as earlier official resolutions of the Congress covered the points raised in this resolution.

The Working Committee appointed the following to constitute the Board of Trustees under Article XX(h) of the Congress constitution:

Messrs. U.N. Dhebar, Morarji Desai (*ex-officio*), Jagjiwan Ram, Lal Bahadur Shastri, S.K. Patil, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, and K.P. Madhavan Nair.

The Congress President was authorised to get the necessary Trust Deed prepared for the functioning of the Board of Trustees.

Organisational Matters

The Committee considered the note regarding the organisational set-up. The following decisions were taken:

(i) A Committee consisting of Shri Gulzarilal Nanda, Shri Balvantray Mehta, Shri Sriman Narayan, K.P. Madhavan Nair, Mahendra Mohan Choudhary was constituted to prepare a Note containing the relevant points for the Election Manifesto and this note was to be considered by the informal meeting of the AICC at Calcutta.

(ii) Regarding the distribution of personnel between the organisation and the administration, it was decided that organisational needs should be kept in view at the time of selection of Congress candidates for the Parliament and the State Legislatures.

(iii) The Congress President apprised the Committee about the need of enforcing stricter discipline.

The Committee decided that discipline should be strictly enforced. The President was authorised to take note of any indiscipline and refer it to the Disciplinary Action Committee.

The Disciplinary Action Committee consisting of Shri Govind Ballabh Pant, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri and Shri Sriman Narayan was enlarged by the addition of three more members: Messrs. Abul Kalam Azad, Jagjiwan Ram and Balvantray Mehta.

The Committee adopted the following resolution regarding Government Securities.

GOVERNMENT SECURITIES

“The Treasurer or any of the General Secretaries of the All India Congress Committee is authorised to endorse, transfer, negotiate, sell, purchase, or deal with Government Securities on behalf of the All India Congress Committee.”

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru gave a review of the international situation specially mentioning about the latest developments regarding the

Nationalisation of Suez Canal Company by Egypt. Shri V.K. Krishna Menon answered certain questions put to him in this connection.

The Committee adjourned at 11.20 A.M. to meet again at 5 P.M.

* * * *

The Working Committee met again on Sunday the 5th August, at 5 P.M. Shri U.N. Dhebar presided. Except Shri G.L. Nanda all the members and invitees, present in the morning sitting, attended.

The Committee considered the office note and the letter of Shri V.L. Mehta dated 12th June, 1956 regarding arrangement of exhibitions during the Congress Sessions.

The Congress President was authorised to discuss the matter further with the Chairman of the All India Khadi and Village Industries Board and take such decisions as he may think necessary.

The Committee took note of the move of the Members of Parliament in moving an amendment in the Lok Sabha for the formation of a bigger bilingual State of Bombay. Almost all the members expressed their views regarding the matter. The consensus of opinion was that to collect signatures on such a vital question was not very desirable. The Committee decided that the question be referred to the four-man Sub-Committee for States Reorganisation for decision and necessary action.

The Committee then adjourned at 6.45 P.M.

Document No. 116

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

New Delhi, October 25, 1956

(INFORMAL MEETING)

An informal meeting of the Working Committee was held on Thursday, 25th October, 1956 at 5 P.M. at 1, Trimurti Marg, Shri U.N. Dhebar presided.

The following members and invitees were present: Messrs. U.N. Dhebar, Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Govind Ballabh Pant, Jagjiwan Ram, Hafiz Mohd. Ibrahim, Giani Gurmukh Singh Musafir, Adityendra, Balvantray Mehta, Sriman Narayan, K.P. Madhavan Nair and Mahendra Mohan Choudhary.

Dr. Syed Mahmud, Dr. K.N. Katju, were present as invitees.

The rules framed under various articles of the Congress constitution were considered. The Congress President explained the main features of the changes.

Shri Madhavan Nair explained the idea of formation of teams of Active Members and the provision for associate membership of the teams. It was suggested that leaders of the teams be appointed by the DCC executives in consultation with the PCC President instead of the PCC executive in consultation with DCC Presidents. The consensus of opinion was that the number of members in the teams should not be more than 50 in each. Attention of the Committee was also drawn to the rule under Article XII(d) regarding the manner of nomination of special elements inadequately represented, and to rules under Article XIII regarding the formation of *ad hoc* Committees.

The Committee was also apprised about the power being given to the PCCs and the Working Committee for the removal of Scrutiny Committees, Tribunals and the Pradesh Returning Officers if they did not discharge their functions properly.

The attention of the Committee was also drawn to rules under Article XXVIII regarding formation of Parliamentary Board and the Election Committees.

The programme for the Calcutta session of the AICC was approved as follows:

9th November, 1956:

8.30 A.M.	Flag Hoisting
9.30 A.M.	Working Committee
3.00 P.M.	Working Committee
5.00 P.M.	AICC Open Session
7.30 P.M.	AICC in two Committees

10th November, 1956:

8.30 A.M.	AICC in two Committees
-----------	------------------------

Document No. 117

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

New Delhi, March 23, 1957

The CWC met at 2.30 P.M. on Saturday the 23rd March, 1957 at the residence of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. The Congress President, Shri U.N. Dhebar was in the Chair.

The following members were present: Messrs. Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Pt. G.B. Pant, Morarji Desai, Srikrishna Sinha, Jagjiwan Ram, Kamraj Nadar, Hafiz Mohd. Ibrahim, Balwantray Mehta, Smt. A.V. Kuttimalu Amma, T.R. Deogirikar, Adityendra, Smt. Indira Gandhi, S.K. Patil, Sriman Narayan, K.P. Madhavan Nair and M.M. Chaudhury.

Dr. B.C. Roy and Giani Gurmukh Singh Musafir were absent. Dr. K.N. Katju, Shri Harekrishna Mahtab, Shri Y.B. Chavan, Shri Gulzarilal Nanda, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, Shri U.S. Malliah and Shri Khandubhai Desai attended the meeting by special invitation.

The proceedings of the Working Committee meeting held on 2nd, 3rd and 4th January, 1957 at Indore were confirmed.

Review of Election Results

The Committee reviewed the general election results. All the members present gave their own assessment and laid emphasis on the fact that the Congress organisation should be placed on a sound footing. The Congress President informed the members of the Working Committee the implications of the resolution recently adopted by the CPB with regard to the candidates, including the Ministers, who failed in the elections.

Annual Budget

The Committee considered the AICC budget for the year 1st December, 1956 to 30th November, 1957. A sum of Rs. 6 lakhs for expenses on revenue heads and Rs. 21,000/- on capital heads during the year was approved.

Venue and Date of the AICC Meeting and Congress Session

It was decided that the next meeting of the AICC should be held in New Delhi on June 1 and 2, 1957. It was further decided that the next Congress Session should be held in Assam in January, 1958. The Working Committee should meet on the 15th and 16th January and the AICC and the Subjects Committee on the 16th, 17th and 18th January; the Plenary Session to be held on the 18th (afternoon) 19th and 20th January '58.

Time Table for Congress Elections

The Committee considered the Office-Note suggesting that all Congress elections, including the election of the AICC members and the Congress President, should be finalised by 15th October, 1957 and generally approved of the time-table placed before the Committee. The Congress President was authorised to make suitable changes, if any, and finalise the programme after discussion in the Conference of the PCC Presidents and Secretaries.

Opening of a Kisan Department in the AICC

(a) The Committee considered and endorsed the Office-Note suggesting the opening of a Kisan Department in the AICC Secretariat, to co-ordinate the activities of the departments organised on the Pradesh level and to safeguard the legitimate interests of the Kisans.

Registration of Akali Bharat Rachanatmak Karya Samity

(b) The Note regarding the scheme for Registration of a Committee, to be known as Akali Bharat Rachanatmak Karya Samity, was placed before the Working Committee. The Congress President was authorised to finalise the Memorandum and the rules and regulations of the proposed Samity in the light of the suggestions given by the members.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru gave a review of the international situation, specially dealing with the problems relating to middle East and Kashmir.

Document No. 118

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

New Delhi, May 25, 1957

The Working Committee met at 3 A.M. at the residence of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, New Delhi, on Saturday the 25th May, 1957 with Shri U.N. Dhebar in the Chair. All the members were present.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, Shri Gulzarilal Nanda, Shri U.S. Malliah, Shri Khandubhai Desai, Dr. Syed Mahmud, Shri Ajit Prasad Jain and Shri T.T. Krishnamachari attended the meeting by special invitation.

The proceedings of the meeting held on March 23, 1957 were confirmed.

Review of the Food Situation in India

Shri Ajit Prasad Jain, Union Food Minister, gave a full picture of the policy, immediate and long-range, that had been adopted by the Government of India and the measures taken to implement the same. He made special reference to the volume of production of the cereals, mainly rice and wheat and the trends in the price level.

The Congress President invited the members to give their own suggestions. It was generally pointed out that the Central Government should, in cooperation with the State Governments, take steps to utilise fully the irrigation facilities.

Document No. 119

Azad and the Congress Working Committee

New Delhi, August 29-30, 1957

The Working Committee met at 9 A.M. on Thursday the 29th August, 1957 at the residence of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. Shri U.N. Dhebar presided.

The following members were present: Messrs. Jawaharlal Nehru, G.B. Pant, Abul Kalam Azad, Jagjiwan Ram, Giani Gurmukh Singh Musafir, Srikrishna Sinha, Smt. Kuttimalu Amma, Smt. Indira Gandhi, T.R. Deogirikar, Adityendra, Balvantray Mehta, Kamraj Nadar, Sriman Narayan, K.P. Madhavan Nair, and M.M. Chaudhury.

Messrs. K.N. Katju, Syed Mahmud, V.K. Krishna Menon, U.S. Malliah, Gulzarilal Nanda, Ajit Prasad Jain, Khandubhai Desai, and T.T. Krishnamachari attended the meeting as invitees.

The proceedings of the Working Committee meeting held on July 20 and 21 were confirmed. The programme for the AICC meeting scheduled to meet on the 31st August and 1st and 2nd September, 1957 was finalised. It was decided that, on the 31st August, the meeting would consider the proposed amendments to the Congress constitution in both the sessions (9 A.M. to 12.30 P.M.—3 P.M. to 7 P.M.) and that it would be open to press and visitors.

On Sunday the 1st September, there would be informal discussions on problems of food and current economic situation, education, land reforms and the role of cooperatives. On Monday, the 2nd September, there would be a formal session which would take up non-official resolutions and a general statement reviewing the informal discussions would be made.

Every day, there should be half-an-hour's spinning before the meeting starts.

The programme for elections to Mandal, District, Pradesh Congress Committees and AICC was finalised. The Congress President was authorised to make necessary adjustments in the dates.

The Committee considered a note on the Congress sessions. It was decided that, in future, the Congress sessions should be made business-like. It was proposed that the maximum attendance that should be allowed in the Subjects Committee Pandal should be 5,000 and that, in the Sessions of the Congress, the Pandal should not accommodate more than 10,000 people, including members of the Reception Committee, and the Press representatives.

Shri T.T. Krishnamachari placed before the Working Committee a general review of the economic situation in the country. Shri Ajit Prasad Jain gave a review of the food situation and the agricultural production.

The meeting then adjourned.

The Working Committee met again at 5.30 P.M. on Thursday, the 29th August, 1957. Among members, who were present in the morning, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad was absent. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri attended the afternoon session.

Shri Ajit Prasad Jain continued his review on food situation in the country. Shri Khandubhai Desai, Shri Balwantray Mehta, Shri M.M. Chaudhury, Shri T.R. Deogirikar, Smt. A.V. Kuttimalu Amma, Dr. K.N. Katju, Shri G.L. Nanda, Shri K.P. Madhavan Nair, Shri Sriman Narayan, Shri G.B. Pant and Shri Jawaharlal Nehru gave their comments. The Congress President reviewed the points raised by the members and gave his own remarks.

The meeting adjourned at 8 P.M..

* * * *

The Working Committee met again at 9 A.M. on the 31st August, 1957 at the residence of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. All the members who attended the meeting on 29th August were present.

Shri G.L. Nanda gave a review of the land reforms and the progress so far achieved in the different States with regard to implementation of the policy accepted by the Government. Shri A.P. Jain, Shri T.T. Krishnamachari, Shri Khandubhai Desai, Shri S.K. Sinha, Dr. K.N. Katju, Shri Jagiwan Ram, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Shri G.B. Pant, Shri V.K. Krishna Menon and the Congress President gave their own comments. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru was of the opinion that, in addition to the question of land problems, the AICC members should discuss the different aspects of cooperative movement.

The meeting adjourned at 10.45 A.M.

The Working Committee met again at 5 P.M. The Committee considered the amendments, notices of which had been received from the members of the AICC as well as from the Pradesh Congress Committees.

The Committee next considered the non-official resolutions and decided that the resolutions received from Shri Shil Bhadra Yajee, Shri Bhagwan Din Misra and Shri M.D. Tumpaliwar might be placed before the AICC meeting for consideration.

The rules drafted by Shri N.L. Nagar, who had been specially deputed to suggest revision of rules relating to Provident Fund, Leave, T.A. etc. for the AICC staff members, were placed before the Committee. The President was authorised to finalise the same.

The Committee adopted the following resolution regarding the opening of current account with the Devkaran Nanjee Banking Co. Ltd., New Delhi office.

Devkaran Nanjee Banking Co. Ltd.

“Resolved that a current account under the head: All India Congress Committee be and is hereby opened with the Devkaran Nanjee Banking Co. Ltd., New Delhi office. The bankers be and hereby authorised to honour all cheques or other orders drawn and to accept and act upon receipts for moneys deposited with or owing by the Bank on the account or accounts at any time or times kept or to be kept in the name of the said All India Congress Committee provided that such cheques, orders, receipts, bills or notes are signed either by Shri Sriman Narayan or Shri K.P. Madhavan Nair or Shri Mahendra Mohan Chaudhury, General Secretaries for the time being, and to debit such cheques, orders, receipts, bills or notes to the account or accounts be for the time being in credit or overdrawn, and to accept the endorsement either of the aforesaid three General Secretaries on cheques or other orders, bills or notes payable to the said All India Congress Committee.”

“That the bank be furnished with a list of the names of the office-bearers of the All India Congress Committee and a copy of Rules and Regulations of the All India Congress Committee and be from time to time informed by notice in writing under the hand of the President of the All India Congress Committee of any changes which may take place therein, and be entitled to act upon any such notice until the receipt of further notice under the hand of the President.”

The proposed changes in the Rules consequent on the introduction of amendments to the Congress constitution in the AICC meeting in

New Delhi were placed before the Working Committee and the Congress President was authorised to finalise the same in the light of the AICC decision.

The Congress President informed the members that in view of certain technical difficulties that had arisen with respect to the use of the present Office building at 7, Jantar Mantar Road for office work and residences of the AICC staff, it had been decided to purchase a separate plot for the purpose and that the Ministry of Rehabilitation, Government of India, had agreed to refund the money already deposited with them for the purchase of this building.

The meeting dispersed at 8.20 P.M.

Document No. 120

Maulana Azad and the Congress Working Committee

New Delhi, November 16-17, 1957

The Working Committee met at the residence of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru at 3.30 P.M. on Saturday, the 16th November 1957. Shri U.N. Dhebar was in the Chair.

The following members were present: Messrs. Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, B.C. Roy, Balvantray Mehta, K. Kamraj, S.K. Patil, Jagjiwan Ram, G.B. Pant, Gurmukh Singh Musaffir, Shrimati A.V. Kuttimalu Amma, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, Adityendra, T.R. Deogirikar, Dr. S.K. Sinha, Morarji Desai, M.M. Choudhary, Sriman Narayan and K.P. Madhavan Nair.

The following attended by invitation: Messrs. Lal Bahadur Shastri, U.S. Malliah, K.N. Katju, Syed Mahmud, Khandubhai Desai, G.L. Nanda, T.T. Krishnamachari, A.P. Jain, and Y.B. Chavan.

The proceedings of the Working Committee meetings held on August 29 and 30, 1957 were confirmed. The Committee finalised the programme for Gauhati Session of the Congress.

Integration of Regional PCCs

The Committee considered the office note on integration of regional PCCs and endorsed the suggestion that the Regional PCCs should cease to function after the Congress election and that the elections should be conducted by the respective PROs under the general supervision of the integrated PCCs.

The members, however, were of the opinion that for facility of work some convenient arrangement should be made, if necessary, by setting up some zonal committees, in specified areas, to link the DCC and the integrated PCC.

Dearness Allowance of the AICC Staff

The Committee considered the office note recommending the grant of additional dearness allowance to the AICC staff. The members

were of the opinion that some relief should be given to the AICC staff in view of the increasing rise of the price-level in the country. The Committee authorised the Congress President to fix the respective amount of additional dearness allowance for the different categories of Staff.

AICC Budget

The Committee considered the annual AICC Budget and approved the same, amounting to Rs. 7,33,200/- under Revenue Account and Rs. 20,000/- on Capital Account for the year 1957-58. The Committee also sanctioned the excess expenditure incurred during the year 1956-57 on the following heads:

1. Shahdara House	Rs. 100/-
2. Motor Car expenses and other conveyance charges	Rs. 3,000/-
3. Grants to PCCs for organisational work	Rs. 9,596/-
4. Expenses for Small Savings Movement Organisation	Rs. 418/-
5. Grant-in-aid to Ambar Charkha Vidyalaya	Rs. 9,000/-
6. AICC Working Committee, PCC Presidents and Secretaries and other meeting expenses	Rs. 7,500/-
7. Miscellaneous Expenses	Rs. 2,437/-
8. Aid to political sufferers	Rs. 815/-
9. Loss on sale of a motor car	Rs. 950/-
10. Contribution to Tilak Centenary Committee	Rs. 15,000/-
11. Purchase of a motor car	Rs. 8,000/-

Funds: The members were of the opinion that steps should be taken to dispose of the following Funds as early as possible:

1. All India INA Enquiry and Relief Committee Fund.
2. All India States Peoples' Conference Fund.
3. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel National Memorial Fund.

Review of the Subjects discussed in the AICC Session of September, 1957

Food Problems: Shri A.P. Jain gave a review of the food situation in the country.

The meeting then adjourned at 7.30 P.M. to meet again on the 17th November at 9.30 A.M.

Sunday, November 17, 1957

The Working Committee met again on Sunday, the 17th November 1957 at 9.30 A.M. All members who attended the previous day's meeting were present. Among the special invitees all were present except Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri and Dr. K.N. Katju.

The Committee continued the discussion on food problem and adopted a resolution.

Economic Situation: Shri T.T. Krishnamachari gave a short review of the economic situation.

Land Reforms: Shri G.L. Nanda informed the Committee that the discussion in the last session of the AICC relating to land reforms and co-operative farming had salutary effect in the States and more effective steps were being taken on the lines indicated therein.

It was decided that the question of educational reforms would be taken up in the next meeting of the Working Committee.

Non-official resolutions

The Committee considered the resolutions that had been referred to it by the AICC.

(a) With regard to the resolution which had been given of by Shri Sheela Bhadra Yajee (Bihar), banning all forms of strike, the members were of the opinion that such a resolution could not be accepted in the present context of things.

(b) With regard to the resolution of Shri Bhagwan Din Mishra (UP) suggesting that no office-bearers should hold office for more than two terms in the organisation as well as in the Government, the members were of the opinion that, though it was desirable to have changes, no hard and fast rule was possible.

(c) The Committee considered the resolution of Shri M.D. Tumpaliwar (Nagpur) suggesting that a Committee be appointed to fix a national minimum in the standard of living and the period of its achievement, and decided that the resolution may be forwarded to the Planning Commission.

Question of paid Vice-Chancellor seeking Office in the Congress

(a) The Committee considered the office note regarding the

question of whole-time Vice-Chancellors seeking office in the Congress organization and decided that, in the interest of the University concerned and also of the organisation, the whole-time Vice-Chancellors should not seek office in the Congress organisation.

(b) *MPs holding office in the Congress Organisation:* The Committee also considered the question of MPs holding office in the Congress organisation and reiterated their earlier decision that no member of Parliament should hold office as the President or Secretary of any PCC or DCC.

(c) *Employees of Life Insurance Corporation:* The Committee also considered the question of employees of the Life Insurance Corporation.

Document No. 121

Tribute to Azad by the All India Congress Committee

New Delhi, May 10-12, 1958

PROCEEDINGS

The All India Congress Committee met at 8.30 A.M. on Saturday on the 10th May, 1958 at Sapru House, New Delhi. Three hundred and ten members attended the meeting.

The proceedings started with spinning for half-an-hour, followed by the singing of Bande Mataram. The minutes of the AICC meeting which met as Subjects Committee on the 16th January, 1958, at Pragiyotishpur, Gauhati, Assam, were confirmed.

In his opening remarks Shri U.N. Dhebar, Congress President, said that during the last three and half years that he functioned as the President of the organisation, the Congress had not passed through greater difficulties than it had during the last three or four months, specially the last fortnight, when Shri Jawaharlal Nehru expressed his desire to relinquish his office. It was a great relief to the people of the country and to this organisation that Panditji complied with the requests of his Party colleagues at last and agreed to continue as the Prime Minister of India. Shri Nehru had obviously been troubled by some problems in the organisation and some happenings in the country.

The problems of the country were formidable, but in so far as the Party was concerned, Shri Dhebar urged that it could definitely do something of a concrete nature and gives the Prime Minister some assurance and restore his confidence in the organisation. He made an appeal to Congressmen to do their best to relieve Panditji of his anxieties to the wishes of the Party colleagues Panditji had thrown a heavy responsibility on Congressmen.

Speaking on the position of the Party in the estimation of the public, Shri Dhebar said that being in power for a decade the organisation would naturally be the object of bitter criticism and incur some unpopularity. But, he reminded Congressmen that they had to be true to the ideology and the principles laid down by the Party. It was high

time now, he said, that the Congress workers did some self-introspection in order to assess how far the ideals and principles of the Party were being translated into action. He asked the AICC to devote its attention to this question so that Congressmen might have necessary clarification.

Continuing, Shri Dhebar said that the Congress had accomplished a great deal during the last ten years. A comparative study of the picture of India ten years back and now would establish the truth of such a statement, he remarked. Not only on the political and economic but on the intellectual plane also the Congress had contributed much for the advancement of the country, he observed. But, he pointed out that there was no denying the fact that the organisation was suffering from some weaknesses and defects inside.

He drew the attention of the members to his Note on organisational matters, already circulated in the meeting, and requested them to discuss the organisational problems in the light of his Note in an informal way in the meeting.

The Congress President then referred to the sad demise of Maulana Azad and said that his passing away at this stage had created a void in the leadership of the Congress. Maulana Sahib was the root of the Congress leadership. Not only the Congress but the whole country suffered a great loss in his death. Moving the condolence resolution on the death of Maulana Azad he said that Maulana Sahib was a source of strength to the country as a whole.

Members then unanimously passed the following resolution moved by the Congress President and approved of the decision of the Working Committee to organise a National Memorial:

Maulana Azad National Memorial

“The All India Congress Committee records and confirms the resolution of the Working Committee on the passing away of their illustrious colleague, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and offers its homage to his memory. The Committee approved of the decision of the Working Committee to organise a national memorial to further some of the causes that Maulana Azad had at heart and in particular, to further knowledge and understanding of each other between the people of India and peoples of Western Asia and to promote their cultural contacts.

“The Provisional National Memorial Committee should consist of:

U.N. Dhebar

Dr. Sarvepali Radhakrishnan
Dr. Bidhan Chandra Roy
Acharya J.B. Kripalani
Dr. Zakir Hussain
Jawaharlal Nehru
Morarji Desai
Dr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliar
B. Gopala Reddy
K.P. Madhavan Nair— Secretary
Humayun Kabir

with power to add to their number. The Committee appeals to the nation to respond generously to the appeal for this memorial.”

PART IV

Document No. 122

The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Bill, 1957

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education and Scientific
Research (Dr. K.L. Shrimali):** Sir, I move:¹

“That the Bill to provide for the preservation of ancient and historical monuments and archaeological sites and remains of national importance, for the regulation of archaeological excavations and for the protection of sculptures, carvings and other like objects be taken into consideration.”

The House will remember that I had given an assurance that I would bring forward a comprehensive measure on this subject. That has been overdue for some time, since the present law is entirely unsatisfactory.

The Constitution has distributed the subject under three heads. There is entry 62 in the Union List, there is entry 12 in the State List and there is entry 40 in the Concurrent List. Though the Constitution has thus distributed the subject under three heads there is only one law and that is the Act of 1904 which operates. The difficulty with regard to this Act of 1904 is that as far as the State List is concerned, the Act becomes completely ineffective, because the Act of 1904 vests the executive authority in the Central Government and the Central Government is not in a position to exercise authority in view of the constitutional provision which vests such authority in the State Government. Therefore, the Act of 1904 has practically become a dead letter so far as ancient monuments falling in the State field are concerned. The main purpose for bringing out this measure now is that it will now be a self-contained law at the Centre which will apply exclusively to ancient monuments of national importance falling under entry 67 of List I—the Union List, and

1. On behalf of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad in the Rajya Sabha on 11-2-1958.

to archaeological sites and remains falling under entry 40 in the Concurrent List. The Central Government has also advised the State Governments, to enact their own legislation in respect of ancient monuments falling under entry 12 in the State List. In this way we will ensure that there is no overlapping of jurisdiction and no confusion which arose from the Act of 1904. I am glad to say that the State Governments of Orissa and Uttar Pradesh have already enacted their legislation in this matter, and we have been told that Bombay and West Bengal have also prepared their Bills and they would now be introduced.

The present Bill is broadly modelled on the lines of the Act of 1904. It does contain certain new provisions which are intended to overcome certain difficulties which we had experienced in the working of the Act of 1904. I would draw the attention of the House to some of the important provisions.

Firstly, I may point out that in the Act of 1904, the Collector had been given wide powers and he had a wide jurisdiction and functions to perform. In the changed circumstances, the Collector is naturally responsible to the State Government and he is disinclined to perform certain statutory functions without reference to the State Government. Therefore, it has been considered necessary to give some of these powers to the Department of Archaeology itself and some of the functions which were formerly performed by the Collector will now be performed by the Director General of Archaeology.

Then on the lines of section 3 of the Act of 1904, the present Bill provides for monuments or sites to be declared of national importance by a preliminary and formal notification in the Official Gazette instead of by a law passed by Parliament as is now necessary under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites Act of 1951. Everytime we want to declare or protect a monument, we had to come to Parliament and pass a legislation.

Now, Sir, after the amendment of Entry 67 of the Union List by the Seventh Amendment to the Constitution in 1956, the Central Government has been given the necessary powers to protect the monuments through a notification in the Gazette. It would be seen that the Act of 1904 had also provided that the Central Government, if it wanted to protect or maintain any particular monument, could enter into certain agreements with the owners of the monuments. Certain conditions were provided under which that agreement could be entered into. It has however been found by experience that some of these monuments which are in private hands are being neglected since the owners are not willing to enter into

any agreement with the Government. Now, Sir that creates a very difficult position. The monument is a national treasure and certainly we would not like these national treasures to be wasted. Now, the new Bill provides that where the owner of the protected monument refuses to enter into such an agreement, the Central Government may make an order for the maintenance of the monument which shall be binding on the owner. Clause 9 makes that provision.

Now, Sir clause 24, gives power to the Central Government to regulate excavations in archaeological sites which are not declared to be of national importance. Now, according to clause 24, "No State Government shall undertake or authorise any person to undertake any excavation or other like operation for archaeological purposes in any area which is not a protected area except with the previous approval of the Central Government and in accordance with such rules or directions, if any, as the Central Government may make or give in this behalf." Now Sir, the House is aware that from the national point of view it is very important that our archaeological sites should be properly protected. Sometimes, out of ignorance and sometimes out of selfishness, people have been destroying some of these important sites and therefore, it is necessary to give this power to the Central Government to regulate these archaeological excavations and clause 24 makes that provision.

Diwan Chaman Lall (Punjab): Which are the protected monuments which are in private hands for the purpose of which clause 9 of this measure is being approved?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I do not have the list with me but there are quite a number of such monuments and we have had difficulties in arriving at agreements. In Orissa there are a number of monuments in regard to which we have been trying for the last several years to enter into agreements but we have failed. Now, that power of making an order is to be vested with the Central Government.

Shri Amolakh Chand (Uttar Pradesh): Would the hon. Minister like to circulate the list of these monuments that are in the possession of the Education Ministry?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The monuments that are protected by the Act of 1951 are already contained in the Act itself. I may refer the hon. Member to the Ancient and Historical Monuments and Archaeological Remains (Declaration of National Importance) Act, 1951 which was amended on January 4, 1954. There was also another amendment of the Act in 1955 and that gives the complete list.

Shri P.C. Bhanj Deo (Orissa): I have got one dated 1951, 1953, 1954 and 1956. There are some additions to the protected monuments since 1951.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: There are amendments in 1951, 1954 and 1956.

Shri P.C. Bhanj Deo: I have got a Bill here dated 1953.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I will have to check up with regard to 1953. There were amendments in 1951, 1954 and 1956.

Shri P.C. Bhanj Deo: I have not been able to find the 1954 one in the Library.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Bill in 1953 enacted into an Act in 1954.

Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray (West Bengal): The one dated 1953 is a Bill and the one dated 1954 is the Act.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Probably, what you have got is a Bill.

Shri P.C. Bhanj Deo: But this also contains a list.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: May be but that is a Bill.

Shri Amolakh Chand: If you would permit me, Sir, I shall explain the point that I wanted to raise with the hon. Minister. The monuments mentioned in the schedules of the various Acts are those monuments which have been accepted by the Government of India but there are other monuments about which the Government of India have not taken any decision. This is the proper time when the Members of Parliament would like to go into that question and decide whether we should accept those monuments or not.

Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray: This can now be done under a Notification.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I was explaining that certain power has been given to the Central Government for regulating excavations in archaeological sites and clause 24 makes that provision. Now, it has also been noticed that sometimes ugly structures and ugly buildings are put up near the historical monuments and those ugly structures spoil the whole site of the protected area.

Clause 19 deals with restrictions on enjoyment of property rights in protected areas. It says, "No person, including the owner or occupier of a protected area, shall construct any building within the protected area or carry on any mining, quarrying, excavating, blasting or any operation of a like nature in such area, or utilise such area or any part thereof in any other manner without the permission of the Central Government." For example, in Orissa, the temples there are some of the best of our monuments and the best of human creations but if you go round the

temples, you find all kinds of ugly structures put up sometimes for selfish purposes. Government have been trying to remove these but the people would not agree and, therefore, this clause has been introduced and this clause gives power to the Central Government to restrict the building operations and also quarrying and excavating or blasting near the monuments.

A new provision has been introduced with regard to compulsory purchase of antiquities and other objects of historical and archaeological importance on payment of compensation. Our country, of course, is very rich in these antiquities but, sometimes out of neglect, sometimes out of selfish purposes, etc., these antiquities are being destroyed. Now, clause 26 gives the Central Government power in this regard. It says, "If the Central Government apprehends that any antiquity mentioned in a notification.... is in danger of being destroyed, removed, injured, misused or allowed to fall into decay or is of opinion that, by reason of its historical or archaeological importance, it is, desirable to preserve such antiquity in a public place, the Central Government may make an order for the compulsory purchase of such antiquity at its market value and the Collector shall thereupon give notice to the owner of the antiquity to be purchased."

Shri H.D. Rajah (Madras): I cannot understand the market value in the case of antiquities.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The market value will have to be assessed.

Then, Sir, sometimes during the process of excavation also some antiquities are discovered. Now, Sir, the Central Government can, in accordance with clause 23(3), "make an order for the compulsory purchase of any such asntiquities at their market value." That provision has also been made in clause 28. Then, Sir, the Act of 1951 and section 126 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956, are being repealed without affecting the declarations made thereby.

Then there are other Clauses according to which the Central Government will have to give compensation, and whenever they are acquiring certain monuments or antiquities, compensation will have to be paid to the owners, and the provision has been made. But it is very difficult to determine how much compensation will have to be paid, because it is not possible to assess the amount of money which will have to be paid, beforehand.

Then clause 38 of the Bill empowers the Central Government to make rules.

Sir, these are some of the important provisions which have been added to the Act of 1904. This makes the law self-sufficient. The Central Government will now be able to look after the monuments which are either in the Union List or in the Concurrent List, and the State Governments have been advised to enact their own legislation for the protection of their monuments. After this Bill has been passed, that confusion which existed in the past on account of this misunderstanding will be removed. I therefore request the House to consider the Bill.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Motion moved:

“That the Bill to provide for the preservation of ancient and historical monuments and archaeological sites and remains of national importance, for the regulation of archaeological excavations and for the protection of sculptures, carvings and other like objects be taken into consideration.”

Shri H.D. Rajah (Madras): Sir, while generally approving the contents of this Bill there are certain doubts which are not cleared by this Bill, which is supposed to be a comprehensive piece of legislation now brought forward by the Government of India, but at the same time the Minister said that the States are requested to pass similar legislation. There is again a confusing thing in the minds of the people because, when these ancient monuments are to be protected and preserved, I always welcome a single authority. If the Government of India takes over the responsibility and spends enough money on these ancient monuments, that should be enough and then the function of the States will, under a devolution of authority given by the Centre, be to take care of these monuments, and there is no use the States again passing legislations which are duplicating and which will create again confusion in the minds of the public.

Then, Sir, when we come to clause 2 (b) (iv) it says, “antiquity” includes any article, object or thing of historical interest.” I am not able to know whether “any article” includes statues, much more so when we are all opposed to the perpetuation of slavery in the form of statues which we see all round this country.

Shri Amolakh Chand: It is there “which has been in existence for not less than one hundred years.”

Shri H.D. Rajah: Therefore, I want to point out that a clarification is necessary and it should read “any article, object or thing of historical interest which has been in existence for not less than one hundred years” but not the statues of foreigners. The Britishers came and

squatted here and their history of this country is placed at one hundred years. There are their monuments or rather statues which may come as articles under this sub-section 2 (b)(iv), and you can allow these monstrous things to be perpetuated and allowed to be kept in India in any part. That is a shameful aspect which we should get rid of, I want a special provision inserted in this Bill that the statues of foreigners, in whatever form they may be and anywhere in this country, are not a part of the monuments or do not come under any of the provisions of this Bill. Unless you insert a positive clause to that effect you will be perpetuating the obsolete hold on this country by foreigners in the form of statues and monuments. The history of a hundred years is not the only history of our country. Our country's history dates back several thousands of years, and those intruders who came stealthily and took charge of our country by playing one against the other, their memories cannot be allowed to be perpetuated in any form in this country. This is a matter which Government must take note of. As you know, Sir, in the various states agitations are being carried on for the British statues to be removed from public places. But I know the apathy and indifference and light-hearted attitude of the Government of India. If they were realistic enough to understand the position and if they were reflecting truly the nature and the aspirations of our Indian people and if they were really in touch with the public opinion in this country, all these monstrous exhibitions throughout India would have been removed, and the bronze or whatever the component part of which the statue is made would have been utilised for better purposes, to augment the resources for our Five Year Plans. Electric wires and so many other things could be had and there is the bronze stuff which could be melted and put to productive use, but nobody seems to think about it.

Shrimati T. Nallamuthu Ramamurthi (Madras): But you are using the language of the foreigner.

Shri H.D. Rajah: A foreign language can be used. Language has nothing to do with individuals. I am speaking English in order to defeat the English. I speak English in order to carry home to them that they are strangers and are unwanted elements in this country. I speak Hindi to be affectionate to my Hindi brethren. I speak my Tamil language because it is my mother tongue. So there is no quarrel with the language. We can destroy them with the same weapons which they used against us. That is the thing.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Well, come to Ancient Monuments.

Shri H.D. Rajah: So my point is that foreign statues are not part of the monuments and they are not wanted in this country. Therefore, Sir, in all respects we should have an amendment of the Act, but it must be made clear beyond doubt that no foreign vestige of any type is part of the ancient monuments of our country. Therefore that clause is to be changed.

Then, Sir, we come to a very funny proposition and that is this. It is in sub-clause 6 (3) which says, "The Central Government or the owner may, at any time after the expiration of three years from the date of execution of an agreement under this section, terminate it on giving six months notice in writing to the other party:

Provided that the owner shall pay to the Central Government the expenses, if any, incurred by it on the maintenance of the monument during the five years immediately preceding the termination of the agreement or, if the agreement has been in force for a shorter period, during the period the agreement was in force."

This is a funny clause in this Bill. You go and declare that a certain thing is a monument and you take charge of the monument from the owner. You incur expenditure to maintain it for some time, and then, if you think fit, you give back that monument to that man and say, "You pay me back the money spent on its maintenance." Is it to make him bankrupt by this provision, or are you acquiring that monument for some consideration and for some purpose, or are you entering into an agreement with the owner to make him pay back the expenses that you incur on its maintenance? Where is the fun of your asking back the money from the owner? Are you so much poverty-stricken? Are your resources so bad that you should have to take the money back?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I may inform the hon. Member that I have an amendment on the subject to the effect, "That at page 5, line 35, for the words "the owner shall" the words "where the agreement is terminated by the owner, he shall" be substituted.

Shri H.D. Rajah: Whoever may execute the agreement this is a Bill which is intended to take charge of and protect the monuments, and the Government itself is to be made responsible, and if there is money to be spent, they spend the money on the monument. Either it is a monument or it is a stone. You might have taken a stone from the owner thereof considering it to be a monument and incurred expenditure on its maintenance, and then some higher officer may find that it is not an ancient monument and that the expenses should not have been incurred.

To escape from such a contingency you may terminate the agreement with the owner and demand from him the expenses incurred on the maintenance of the alleged monument. I cannot allow such things to happen. So before you declare that a certain thing is some ancient monument of some antiquity, before you go into the historical aspect of its nature you should be doubly assured and protected yourself. When it has been taken as a "protected monument" and when you spend money on it, it is for good that you have spent it and there is no need for you to make the owner pay back the money which you have spent on it. That clause is highly improper in this Bill and must be removed.

Then, I come to clause 9. It says:

"If any owner or other person competent to enter into an agreement under section 6 for the maintenance of a protected monument refuses or fails to enter into such an agreement....The Government may make an order providing for all or any of the matters specified in sub-section (2) of section 6 and such order shall be binding on the owner or such other person and on every person claiming title to the monument from, through or under the owner or such other person."

Sir, you may make an order on the owner but what is the effect of that order? Is it that he should maintain compulsorily or that money should be spent by the owner compulsorily? And if that man pleads inability to maintain or even to hand over, what is the position? The order alone is not enough. You take full responsibility for it. You can order for the monument or the antiquity to be handed over to you but your order will be only on paper and that man will refuse to carry it out. Then unnecessarily you have to harass him for failing to comply with your order. You have to prosecute him and there must be penalty that if a man refuses to carry out the order, he shall be punished with simple imprisonment or rigorous imprisonment or with fine or with both. Now, what is the meaning of such a thing in a Bill seeking to provide for the preservation of ancient monuments and archaeological remains and things like that? You have to get the support of, and co-operation from, the person. If a person refuses there must be valid grounds for his refusal. Probably it may be his great-great-great grandfather's burial ground which he cherishes and loves and your order will not be effective on him. If you want to treat it as a monument of national importance, in that case you have to take over. Your order has no value and it is not

possible that simply because you gave an order, that order must be carried out or obeyed for monetary considerations. That is not the way in which a monument is to be acquired.

Then, if we come to clause 20, what do we find? It says:

“If the Central Government is of opinion that any protected area contains an ancient monument or antiquities of national interest and value, it may acquire such area under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, as if the acquisition were for a public purpose within the meaning of that Act.”

That clause is very ambiguous. If the Land Acquisition Act is to be applied, does it mean that the contents are also included for purchase or does it only mean the land where they are situated? Suppose for example a certain area is there in which precious possessions are held and they are very ancient. We do not know what is there. Suppose there is a tomb. What kind of a tomb is that is a matter which the Government must decide. When you want to acquire that particular land, the man says that there is this tomb. You must pay for the tomb. For instance, in Madras there is a funny thing happening. In a certain corner of Mount Road there is a tomb being preserved by some mullahs who make a lot of money with that. If you go to the Round Thana, in the corner somewhere near the Mount Road, opposite to Wellington Talkies, you will find this tomb and this is supposed to be containing the remains of some ancient saint. Some people are maintaining it and making a lot of money out of it. When you want to acquire this if they refuse to part with it, what is the position? Therefore merely if you say that a place will be acquired on the basis of the Land Acquisition Act, it will not be all right and above all, the Government must have a basic principle in mind, namely, what is to be declared as an ancient monument and once a declaration is made, you have to negotiate with the private parties concerned, whoever they may be, and with their willing co-operation and assistance you must conclude a deal with them. Then do not equivocate about it. There must not be any equivocation about it; there cannot be further laws or orders issued about that. We take charge of ancient monuments and when we take charge of them, they become the nations' property. There is no question of higgling-haggling after this; there must be no dilly-dallying. When once you take charge, all the other things found here must be completely eliminated. There is no point in taking over a thing first and then handing it back. There is no point in acquiring simply the land and

not doing anything for the contents of the land. There should be no question of such dubious methods being allowed and then have litigation started on these points. If that is done, it will be a lawyers' paradise again; it will not be preservation of ancient monuments, stones or coins or things like that. I do not want a situation like that to arise.

Then there is another funny proposition here which you will find if you read clause 26 (1):

"If the Central Government apprehends that any antiquity mentioned in a notification issued under sub-section (1) of section 25 is in danger of being destroyed, removed, injured, misused or allowed to fall into decay or is of opinion that, by reason of its historical or archaeolgoical importance, it is desirable to preserve such antiquity in a public place, the Central Government may make an order for the compulsory purchase of such antiquity at its market value and the Collector shall thereupon give notice to the owner of the antiquity to be purchased."

What is the definition of 'antiquity' which you have seen in the Bill? Antiquity includes any article, object or thing of historical interest, any coin, sculpture, manuscript, epigraph, or other work of art or craftsmanship and so on, There are so many definitions about antiquity. Let us take, for instance, a coin. We see in a place an antiquity in the form of a gold mohur of 2,000 B.C. I am not referring to A.D., I am talking of B.C. We can never assess the market value of this. If it is taken over, what is the market value our friends are going to pay? There is no possibility of its market value being assessed. Nobody is having it as a current exchange in the Stock Exchange as Mundhra group of shares which are sold in the exchange where there is buying and selling, there is inflated price and then a deflated price, where when a purchase is made it goes up and the next day the price falls to Rs. 2 and so on. So far as the Archaeolgoical Department is concerned, this coin may be an important thing but its market value cannot be assessed. Therefore what I would suggest is — and I am always positive in my suggestions; you know it very well — you say a price acceptable to both the parties. If you put that in, then it is a question of opening negotiations and nobody else will come and purchase it because we have get a provision for compulsory acquisition of antiquities. When that provision is there, nobody else will be interested and therefore the market will not come into the picture. We can pay a price agreed to by both the parties and acceptable to both.

Therefore this clause requires modification if a proper working of the Act is our main motive.

Shri N.C. Sekhar (Kerala): Here 'market value' is unnecessary.

Shri H.D. Rajah: That is what I say.

Now we come to clause 27. It reads:

"Any owner or occupier of land who has sustained any loss or damage or any diminution of profits from the land by reason of any entry on, or excavations in, such land or the exercise of any other power conferred by this Act shall be paid compensation by the Central Government for such loss, damage or diminution of profits."

This is wholly unnecessary because I feel that no man can trespass into another man's house. He will be immediately prosecuted. Trespassers are not allowed. Why should a man sustain damage or any diminution of profits by an unwarranted act? A man cannot enter into another man's property and carry on digging operations. That itself is a basically wrong thing to do. You cannot come into my house and start digging. I may ask my servant to eject you or push you out or I will ask the Police to come to my aid and you may be prosecuted. So before you enter into another man's house for digging operations you must have an agreement with the man. First you enter into an agreement with him and then go and dig his grave.

I have no objection. But before you go and do something, you involuntarily or rather by force enter into his house and start digging and then he howls and then you step in and then here you want to give him compensation. That is wrong. The basic principle itself is wrong. And the way to do the thing, for assessment of the value of the antiquity or the ancient thing is that we should first of all have to ascertain whether there is anything of importance in that house or in that compound. If there is, then contact the man, preserve his individual freedom and liberty, negotiate with him and the basis is not the basis of clause 27, but the basis is again the basis of agreement. Therefore, you have to talk to him in a manner which will appeal to him and never pay the public exchequer's money in the form of compensation to somebody who does not deserve it or whose sanctity you violate and then give compensation. These are wholly out of question and it is not the way to deal with him. Therefore, preserve his dignity and his honour. Give him the protection that he demands in law and then do not enter and say something has been done in order to dig your grave. I come here and

give you compensation. That is not the way to deal with that and you must have a better concept of life and sanctity of life and property.

Now, Sir, I come to the last point. Though the Bill is a very desirable one, there are very serious lacunae and drafting defects. Once I had occasion to tell this House that the drafting is done by law college students in our Secretariat. They do not have enough time; they do not have enough experience; and whenever a law is made it is made in a hurry, within twentyfour hours or fortyeight hours, as the case may be, because they want work in this Parliament and the Parliament must be employed to talk and so laws are made and they are very defective. Subsequently they are found useless in courts of law and are creators of mischief and litigation. Therefore, I would request the hon. Minister again to go carefully through the provisions of this Bill and even to introduce an amended Bill on the same and see that rational things which are talked in this House are implemented and a rational Bill is brought before this House.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: You can put in amendments.

Shri P.C. Bhanj Deo: Mr. Vice-Chairman, it was with a sense of pleasure and satisfaction that I heard the Minister make his statement in connection with the Bill before the House, especially so as it is calculated to further archaeological finds and research in this country, which is so rich in its past heritage. But there is one matter that was referred to by the first speaker, and another matter which was also referred to by the speaker before me, namely, that this legislation is rather late. It should have come long before. And also, before bringing in this legislation or proceeding with this legislation, the House should have been informed about the criterion the Government adopts for declaring certain monuments as of national importance and others of not national importance. This is particularly so to me when I consider the fact that in the series of amendments which have gone through this House in connection with this subject in the past, many fruitful suggestions and information have been put forward for the protection of ancient monuments and the pursuit of archaeological research both on the floor of this House and on the floor of the other House. Some of these suggestions, I am glad to say, have been adopted by the Government, but others have not been adopted so far, although they were of a similar nature to the ones which have been adopted. I would like to know why that is so. The House may remember that when we debated a similar Bill to this in 1953, I had made certain suggestions about the much neglected Yogini Chakras existing in Orissa and

Madras. I had pointed out at that time that these Yogini Chakras were common to Hinduism, Buddhism and Jainism, and hence apart from their being relics of archaeological interest, they were important landmarks for the study of social students and social organisers who are naturally interested in the fusion of cultures. I also pointed out at that time the sad state in which these Yogini Chakras existed. Much vandalism has been committed in connection with them and, as the hon. Minister himself has remarked, the images have been broken and shattered in many places. The Chakras have been destroyed. Circular temples of this kind have been destroyed, here and there.

One of the chief distinguishing features of these temples is their circular structure. That is why they are called Chakras. They are very similar to the circular churches that England is so proud of today. Although these Chakras are very limited in number in this country, it is only recently – I see by the lists here and by certain information given me by the Archaeological Department – that two of these Yogini Chakras have been taken under the protection of the Central Government. After the debate in 1953 it seems that the Hirapur Yogini Chakra near Bhubaneswar and the Yogini Chakra of Behra Ghat near Jubbulpur were taken under the protection of the Government. Incidentally, I have not been able to find the gazette notification about the taking of the Behra Ghat Yogini Chakra under the protection of the Government, but I have been told quite authoritatively by the Archaeological Department that this has happened.

Apart from these two Yogini Chakras there are other Yogini Chakras which are entirely neglected so far. There is the Yogini Chakra at Coimbatore in Madras of which it is surprising to learn that the Archaeological Department has no information whatever. Although Dr. Cunningham mentions about this Yogini Chakra and gives the measurements in his Archaeological Survey of India, up-to-date, repeated correspondence with the Archaeological Department, to give me facilities to go there and take photographs for myself has been utterly fruitless because the Archaeological Department do not know where the Yogini Chakra is. Similar is the case of another Yogini Chakra which is mentioned to be at Sorada. Now, where Sorada is seems to be a great mystery. Neither the Archaeological Department knows nor any other Department or officer of the Government of India knows....

Shri H.D. Rajah: Do you know?

Shri P.C. Bhanj Deo: I do not know, but it is mentioned in Cunningham Report and the measurements of the Yogini Chakra are given there, so that with a little labour, in my opinion, the Government could easily locate the place where these archaeological sites and interesting relics are situated.

It has been a source of some disappointment to me that in spite of repeated insistence on the floor of this House and elsewhere, the Yogini Chakra of Ranipur Jharial has not yet been taken under Government's protection. The condition of the different images and the Yogini Chakra there is really deplorable. The images have been shattered in many places, and when I went there with the Maharaja Sahib of Kalahandi in order to do some research and take some photographs, I had literally to pick up stone by stone and put certain images together in order to be able to take any coherent photographs. They were in such damaged condition.

Sir, it is my humble submission to the Government that if they are really serious about tackling these things specially in the archaeological field and in the field of ancient monuments in the interest of Indian culture and history, it should be done much more promptly and it should be done by active people who will not rest until they find these sites, until they afford interested students and research scholars opportunities for writing about these works and proclaiming to the world how great our ancient heritage was. In this connection I would also like to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that in my last speech on this subject I had pointed out to them about the rich Tel Valley civilisation in Orissa. The hon. Minister has recently been to Orissa and has seen for himself the richness of its architecture and the greatness of its ancient past. But this greatness is so neglected, as he himself has no doubt noticed and has mentioned in this House, that unless active action is taken promptly by the Government, most of the good stuff that is there for the benefit of this country and this nation will be destroyed in a short time. I would like to draw the attention of the Government again to the rich Tel Valley civilisation that is still in existence and may go out of existence in a few years or even months. It is the Tel River of the famous Taila Tata Vaha of the Buddhist Jatakas, and it is on the banks of the Tel River that these hundreds of ancient temples and monuments exist. Right almost from the source of the river in Koraput up to Ranipur Jharial, a whole host of old beautiful temples and forts are there. It is full of not only old temples and forts, but pre-historic glass beads, gold coins of very great interest belonging to the

past and Garuda coins of the Gupta period have been dug up in this wonderfully rich archaeological area. Therefore, it is my humble submission that whatever the present law provides for the protection of this wonderful heritage of our country in Orissa, in Madhya Pradesh, in Madras and Rajasthan and other places, the Education Ministry should make it its first duty to begin in right earnest and employ active officers and students to try and preserve this rich heritage so that India can be proud of telling the world what she had in the past, and on that sound ground what she has been able to build in the present and what she can look forward to in the future.

Sir, much time has passed and there are other speakers also. I wanted to give details about the Tel Valley civilisation to the Minister. But I will do so in correspondence with him. With these few words, Sir, I will now end my speech and allow other members to speak.

Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I believe much has already been said in favour of this Bill and against. It is a Bill which not only brings upto-date the Act of 1904, but it also consolidates quite a number of amendments beginning, I believe, from 1932 onwards right up to 1956. The various adaptation orders and amendment laws that were enacted from time to time were just stop-gap arrangements, and it was necessary that all such stop-gap arrangements be gathered rationally into one self-contained consolidated law of the land. The Minister-in-charge has himself admitted that it is rather late than too soon that this Bill has been presented before us. I agree entirely with him; much time has been lost since we gained our independence. We should have done it earlier, for as a previous speaker pointed out, already in the course of the last 10 years much damage has been done, and the overlapping confusion of powers and privileges of the Centre and the States did make confusion worst confounded, and in this overlapping and confused scheme of things many sites and many antiquities have not only been destroyed beyond recognition, but much has also flown outside the country. I would not try to tread the ground already covered by the Minister-in-charge, nor would I try to present before you the new provisions of the Bill to which attention has been drawn. It is true that it brings the 1905 Act upto-date. It is modelled on that Act, but it also contains a few new and important provisions intended to overcome certain difficulties that were experienced by the officers of the Department as well as by the Government in carrying out the subject matter of the Act in the best and most efficient possible manner.

Certain criticisms have been made in regard to the general drafting

of the Bill, especially in respect of certain of its clauses. I am not an expert in draftsmanship, but as one interested in Indian archaeology I have gone through the various clauses of the Bill and I am convinced, they meet the situation adequately. Whether there are legal flaws or not, I am not competent to say; but some of the criticisms that were voiced by Mr. Rajah were, I am afraid, beside the point. He has raised objections especially in connection with the ownership business. Not that I feel very happy about the concessions extended and the concern shown in respect of private ownership. I believe we could have taken a more straightforward attitude. But the criticisms that were made by Mr. Rajah, as I said, are irrelevant. I do not know if Mr. Rajah has any experience of actual archaeological work or work connected with the declaration of a certain archaeological site or a monument as a protected one, one that is already in private ownership. It may be that the archaeological department takes up the guardianship of a particular monuments or a site in private ownership, it repairs the monument in a scientific manner for, say, five or six years; the owner may then want to get it back provided he gives an undertaking that he will carry on the preservation and protection of the site or the monument according to required measures and standards. If he does want it back, then there is no point in the archaeological department insisting on keeping it. I know of actual examples where things of this nature have taken place.

I do not also feel very happy in respect of the phrase 'at its market value' in clause 26. This, I am afraid, will create difficulties. I do not know if this phrase 'at this market value' can be taken out at this stage or not. Antiquities as such have no market value in the usual sense of the phrase. It is only the collectors who are interested in antiquities and objects of art, and there is a collectors' market. But I know that this collectors' market is a speculators market, and if we enter this market, then, I am afraid, there are bound to be difficulties. But this being a simple matter. I must not dwell upon it at any length. I can only tell the House that if it means the collectors' market then we are in for difficulties. I do not find any other difficulty in respect of any other clauses of the Bill.

My friend, Mr. Bhanj Deo, is so very right in what he said, but then, he was speaking about Orissa alone. My friend over there, the ex-Chief Minister of Madhya Bharat, spoke about Rajasthan and Madhya Bharat. He referred incidentally to the ancient city of Mahishmati. I had been there once in 1937 and again in 1947, and what damage amateurish archaeology is capable of can be seen at that very site.

Archaeology today is almost an exact science. You cannot just dig anywhere in any manner and bring out the antiquities. Thereby not only you destroy the antiquities, but you also destroy valuable archaeological and historical evidence. It is very welcome therefore that some restrictions have been put in the Bill on the right of excavations and the Central Government have taken full power to regulate excavations of archaeological sites which are not declared to be of national importance. Knowing a site as an archaeological one and declaring it as such and also as one of national importance has a time-lag in-between. It may take a year to declare it as a monument of national importance and in the course of that one year, much damage can be done by an amateur archaeologist, a collector or a curio hunter. If therefore the Central Government, which means the Director General of Archaeology, in this case, has the power to regulate excavations there, whether it is by the State Governments or by Universities or by private groups, it is very necessary that all such excavations should be done not only with the knowledge of the Archaeological Department but under the expert advice and guidance of the Director-General of Archaeology. I know of dozens of instances all over India where amateur archaeologists have done irreparable damage. I would not name parties. Even in the course of the last 2 or 3 months, well-known amateur parties have been carrying on excavations of sites in very haphazard manner, not in the manner prescribed and recognised by the latest methods of archaeological excavations. My friend over there referred to Ujjain. I believe he is in the know that important excavations are being carried on there by the Department for the last three years. We have lived, God only knows, for how many thousands of years on this land, and wherever you scratch, whether it is in Rajasthan or in Madhya Pradesh or in Orissa or in the South or even in the new alluvium of Lower Bengal, you strike archaeology everywhere. My friend over there was complaining that the Archaeological Department does not take care of this or that site, relic or monument. I know a little bit of the very important and valuable work of this Department since my vocation takes me all round touring the art and archaeological sites in India. I know also of the Tel Valley culture to which reference has been made. Anywhere you scratch in Orissa, you come upon such treasures. It is not possible for any Government to protect each and every site and monument. Even in Bhubaneswar, perhaps there are about 600 temples, taking everything into account. Is it humanly possible for the Department to protect each and everyone of them? Even in the Tel Valley, only in the course of one

year, the Department has declared as protected monuments, about half a dozen temples. The Department or the Central Government must go by the fact of relative importance, must go by those evidences which are more important relatively. In a country which is very poor in archaeology, even those of poorest importance may be declared as of national importance, but we are so very rich that we can afford to declare as such only those that are historically and nationally important.

But I could not follow the Minister-in-charge in respect of one thing. He claimed — I know I can see from the Bill — that certain powers that there were vested with the Collectors of Districts, have been taken away and now vested in the Director General of Archaeology. This would of course ease the difficulties a great deal. But, even so, whether it is in the States or at the Centre, the Government shall have to function at least in some measure through the Collectors and excuse my saying so from the point of view of this Bill or the purposes of this Bill, most of our collectors are blissfully ignorant. Once I approached a Collector and tried to explain the importance of a particular site, but without success. I cannot blame him. In fact, Collectors too have to be explained what 'Iconography' or 'archaeology' means. So, I don't think just on the strength of the clauses of this Bill we can do without the Collectors as such. I would therefore suggest that, — if it would be possible, I don't know, some provision can be made in the I.A.S. Training School to give certain preliminary lessons to our I.A.S. recruits so that when they are posted in the districts, they can at least take some living interest in local archaeology and cooperate more intelligently with the Archaeological officers, whether of the State or of the Centre.

So far as Entry 12 of our list is concerned, the subject-matter of the Act of 1904 remains with the States. I don't grudge the power of the States. At least two of our State legislatures have enacted laws and two are going to have similar laws enacted. The law, I believe, in West Bengal, has gone through one House. Let us hope that in another 2 or 3 years all our States will have their own laws. But then it is not enough to have laws. It will be necessary for the Centre to see that well-equipped archaeologically trained people are placed in charge of execution of these laws. Who is going to see to that? Then the Centre shall also have to maintain a certain amount of liaison between the Central Department and the State Archaeological Departments. Unless there is some liaison between the two, it will be very difficult to achieve the object that we have all in view.

Now I would not dwell more on any other point. There are a few

others but there are also other speakers. But I must make mention of one. I am not claiming to express the opinion of the House or of any large or small section of the House, much less of the Government, but one utterance of Mr. Rajah took my breath away and that is in respect of total removal of all statues belonging to India on this side of the year 1757. It is true that we had to fight the British Government; we did not, however, fight the English people. It may be also that it is a record of disgrace on our part as much as on the part of the British. But to say in a responsible House and in the Upper House of the Indian Parliament that all statues of foreigners must be dismantled or must not be kept in a public place, is, to my mind, not something that does credit to this House. I would just tell Mr. Rajah that there is a statue of Kanishka in the Mathura Museum. Kanishka was a foreigner. Are we going to throw it into the gutters? Whatever we choose to do, I am afraid, we cannot wipe away history and history has recorded what Clive did and what Warren Hastings did. If we remove statues, we do not remove thereby what Clive or Warren Hastings did. If there is a really fine statue of Clive or Warren Hastings, it is as much a historical monument of national importance as anything else. Have we become so low as to say that all foreigners are untouchables or unseeables because they are connected with a disgraceful past of ours as well as of theirs? Here we are speaking in a scientific and academic spirit. We are dealing with a historical-archaeological Bill. Let us be fair; let us be objective. We are speaking in terms of history; we are not speaking in terms of enraged politics. And, I believe even nationally too, a view like the one given expression to, namely, that all British statues must be removed from all public places, does not do any honour to our national prestige. If we reject a statue, we would do so because it is an ugly thing or an unhistorical object, not because it represents Clive or Warren Hastings. Remember that here we are considering a Bill which originally emanated from one who so far as Indian history goes, is not remembered with gratitude. He was Lord Curzon and let us acknowledge he was the father of the Act of 1904 which is the foundation on which we are trying to frame the new law. Thank you Sir.

The Vice-Chairman (Shri M.B. Joshi): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at one minute past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 12th February, 1958.

Document No. 123

THE ANCIENT MONUMENTS AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES AND REMAINS BILL, 1957—*Contd.*

FURTHER CONSIDERATION DATED 17-2-1958

Mr. Chairman: Dr. Raghubir Sinh.

Dr. Raghubir Sinh (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, I am really relieved to see that at long last the Ministry of Education has delivered the new Bill. I was afraid that because of the long period of gestation that it has taken, there will be some abnormalities in the Bill but I am quite relieved to note that it is not very abnormal though the long period has necessarily stunted it, left it a little incomplete in parts and it lacks the proper perspective of the immediate past.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN *in the Chair*]

Anyway the Bill is before us now and we have to deliberate on it. I am really sorry that the hon. Minister himself has not come here to see the Bill through. I must admit that it is a momentous occasion that after a lapse of full 54 years, a new Bill on the subject is before us. Moreover they have taken full 10 years and more to revise the Bill for being placed before this House. Anyway I would have been very happy if he were here, if that veteran fighter for India's Independence and that staunch supporter of democratic methods were here. I would have then earnestly pleaded before him with all the earnestness and persuasion at my command to accept a humble request of mine. My request is that such a comprehensive Bill, such an important Bill, such a momentous Bill, should have necessarily gone to a Select Committee for consideration. When I referred to the May's Parliamentary Practice, I found that one of the main considerations when a Bill should be referred to a Select Committee is that it contains points of details and matters of a technical nature. This Bill is necessarily a bill of that type. It contains so many details and so many provisions of such technical nature that for them to be deliberated upon in such a big House it not very possible.

Shri Maithili Sharan Gupta: Is there Quorum?

Dr. Raghubir Sinh: He asks whether there is quorum or not. It is for you to say.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: There is quorum.

Dr. Raghubir Singh: The submission therefore is that this Bill should have gone to a Select Committee — more necessarily, if you could possibly permit it, to a Joint Select Committee but I cannot possibly press for that; but I do think that the Bill should go to a Select Committee for consideration.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education and Scientific Research (Dr. K.L. Shrimall): I shall be grateful if the hon. Member will enlighten me as to what the matters are which are agitating his mind, which has led him to suggest that the matter should be referred to a Select Committee.

Dr. Raghubir Singh: Sir, I would only request the hon. Minister not to be so impatient. He will have everything and I have already said in the beginning that it is a matter of principle that I am asking for it. For I expect that when we resort to these means, when we resort to parliamentary methods, we have to lay down some really sound conventions. Democratic methods do not merely mean a form only; it is very much a question of spirit as well and when I go on dealing with that point, I would have clarified the points on which necessarily I want the House to take into consideration and see if they can concede my request for a Select Committee.

Shri Amolakh Chand (Uttar Pradesh): You want a Select Committee of this House or of both the Houses?

Dr. Raghubir Singh: I have already pointed out in the begining that I can only request for a Select Committee of this House and that too only if the hon. Minister agrees; and that is why I was very much wishing that Maulana Saheb would have been here, I would then have been able to plead with him with all the earnestness at my command. Now, I can only expect that the request may be conveyed, properly, duly and sympathetically.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Anyway there is no amendment from you.

Dr. Raghubir Singh: Unfortunately, I was not here on the day when this motion was moved and the only reason why I was not here was that I was otherwise unavoidably imperatively kept at home.

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: I was trying to find out the points which are agitating him but he is not coming to them.

Dr. Raghubir Singh: I cannot educate the Education Minister in being a little more patient. The point is this. I have requested for this Bill being sent to the Select Committee. I might also mention that I did

go with an amendment in that respect and I submitted it to the Secretary but he was of the opinion that obviously enough at this stage it may not be possible for him to entertain it unless the House specially permitted that. So I can't talk of that amendment now without the House agreeing to it.

Shri Amolakh Chand: Has the hon. Member given notice of that amendment?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: No, that is what I told him.

Shri Amolakh Chand: He says that he has already given.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: What transpired between you and the Secretary is not relevant here. What is relevant is that there is no amendment here.

Dr. Raghbir Singh: I was not here when it could have been given notice of.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The Bill had been placed on the Table of the House so many days before. You had ample time. Nothing prevented you from sending any amendments.

Dr. Raghbir Singh: Well, what has not been done before cannot be done now. I am only raising this question in this House for the House to take it into consideration, if the House is in a mood to consider my request. I cannot possibly force its acceptance. I can only plead for its acceptance. What I am saying is that this Bill is a major Bill. It is a comprehensive Bill and a Bill of major importance. Probably, many of us may not realise its importance today, because many of us do not really feel very happy over that man who first initiated these very important proceedings — I mean Lord Curzon. But posterity would always be grateful to that man, and today we are only carrying forward that work of Lord Curzon by means of this Bill.

Coming to the various points in this Bill, which I want the House to take note of, first of all, I would bring to the notice of the House that the powers which the Bill seeks to vest in the Government in respect of monuments and sites and protected areas and those relating to the compulsory purchase of the same or of antiquities are of a very sweeping nature. I do know many of these powers have been copied from the previous Act. But from the very nature of things, they have as yet not been tried in full. We are all aware that since as recently as some years back, we have had a good deal of what we may call deterioration in the standards of the officers. There has been good deal of corruption and there has also been much misuse of all such powers. For these

reasons, I would very much wish that this question, as to whether all these powers that are now being given are really very necessary and whether any possible contrivances or checks can be put in by which it can be fully ensured that these powers are not misused, is considered in fullest details. There should be a full and thorough investigation of all these aspects of the matter. That is very very necessary. As you know, this is a question where we are vesting the Government with wide powers. These wide powers would not only be given to the archaeological officers but they would be given to the revenue officers also. As such it is very much possible that the lower revenue officers may sometimes misuse these powers. There may be cases of corruption. What have we got to guard against that? These are the misuses which do not very often come to the surface and quite often they go unnoticed and unchecked and even, I think, completely unpunished. Therefore, we have to ensure that these powers that we are giving fully to those officers are the powers that are really very necessary. We should see that no loop-holes are left therein and there is no possible misuse.

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: Which clause is the hon. Member referring to?

Dr. Raghbir Singh: For instance the clauses which deal with land acquisition and those relating to compensation.

Shri Kishen Chand (Andhra Pradesh): Clauses 5, 7 and 8.

Dr. Raghbir Singh: If the hon. Minister wants them, I can give all the various references, but I thought the hon. Minister knew all these clauses by heart by now.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: But you must tell him what particular clauses you are objecting to.

Dr. Raghbir Singh: There are very few clauses where this land acquisition question comes in and I thought the Minister would....

Mr. Deputy Chairman: But you must point out where he has gone wrong.

Dr. Raghbir Singh: I am only pointing out where the loop-holes are.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: You are making vague allegations against the Minister.

Dr. Raghbir Singh: I have made no allegations against the Minister. I am only referring to the possibility of misuse, I am not saying that the Minister is going to misuse the powers, but the misuse may occur in the lower strata.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: You have said that the powers given to the Central Government are very sweeping. You may point out to what clause you object.

Dr. Raghbir Singh: There is clause 13, then again there is clause 30. At least these clauses, I can give off-hand. And I think there are one or two other clauses also where certain powers are given to the Collectors and to the lower revenue officers. My point is that these things should be carefully examined before the House passes these provisions.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: He wants to know what is your objection. You are an expert on this subject.

Dr. Raghbir Singh: I may be some sort of an expert in archaeological matters, Sir; I am no expert in revenue matters.

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: What I want to know is this. There are these provisions which enable Government to acquire and protect the monuments so as to prevent the monuments from decaying, or where the private owners are not looking after them properly. Is the hon. Member suggesting that Government should not acquire and protect those monuments?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: What is it that you object to?

Dr. Raghbir Singh: I am not objecting to the particular power that is being asked for. I said only this. There are two things to be examined in this respect. Is this the minimum power that is necessary for this purpose? That is number one. Secondly, whether any proper arrangements will be made by which the possibility of any misuse of these powers is prevented, by which it could be ensured that any such misuse of the same is no longer possible? This is what I want to say. These are matters of detail in which revenue matters will have to be thought of and all persons who are likely to be affected, common men, members can sit and think out and examine that matter in that light.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: You do not want the power to be given to the revenue officers. Then tell him to what officers you would like this power to be given. Be more definite.

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: What is the suggestion that the hon. Member wants to make? There is no use criticising the Bill unless there is also an alternative suggestion.

Dr. Raghbir Singh: I am not criticising it. I am only pointing out that these are the points which should be carefully examined. I am not saying that these powers should not be given. It is just likely that, if I were proposing it, I would probably ask for the same powers.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Then?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The hon. Member himself confesses that if he were to propose such a Bill, he would himself have suggested these powers.

Dr. Raghubir Singh: But you forget the word "probably" that I used. I am in a rather little disadvantageous position in that I do not know how far administratively such powers are needed. He alone can say that.

Shri P.D. Himatsingka (West Bengal): The clauses make it clear.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Clauses 13 and 14 are very clear.

Dr. Raghubir Singh: But sometimes things which seem very clear, they lead to the biggest, or, I would say, to the most intriguing things. We have had a very simple example in the recent past and I need not go further into that point.

The next....

Shri Bhupesh Gupta (West Bengal): What is that example?

Dr. Raghubir Singh: Well, I never thought that my hon. friend on the other side had not got that much imagination.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: But it must be helped. What is that example?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: He never thought you would be interested in archaeology.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: I could not catch it. May I please be enlightened on this example?

Dr. Raghubir Singh: I now come to my next point. The need for such a revised Bill cannot possibly be denied. As I said earlier, the last enactment that was passed was in 1904. At that time, the administrative structure was different; the constitutional position was different. Conditions have changed completely since then. First of all, we had the provincial autonomy and later on, we have had the new Constitution and so, the various administrative provisions made in the Act of 1904 cannot possibly be continued any more. As such, a revision of the Act was really very necessary. I find from the debate that has already taken place on this Bill on the previous day that more than once stress has been laid about the supposed confusion that has been caused in the State field in respect of these monuments. I find, Sir, that some of our ex-Chief Ministers have also said the same thing. I do not know whether the confusion was really anywhere excepting in the minds of the people who say that there is confusion. After the Constitution was adopted, the

position became clear. As such, if certain State Governments did not do anything or could not do anything, it was due to their own lack of initiative and due attention or to their not really attaching all the importance that this matter necessarily deserved. That is why things have happened there in that way. They could have readily adopted this Act of 1904 so far as their State monuments are concerned, *mutatis mutandis*, without any difficulty, pending the necessary comprehensive State legislation. I do not agree, Sir, that all this confusion has been there because of this Act not having been revised earlier. I do admit, Sir, that lack of coordination has created certain difficulties for the Union Government which the hon. Minister has admitted, and in those respects, I do agree with him that the revision of this Act was very very necessary. My only complaint which I voiced earlier also is that this new Bill does not appear to be in due conformity with the correct perspective of the immediate past. There is a long history behind all these monuments now under the protection of the Union Government. In the 1935 Government of India Act, the entry was a simple one. The protection of the ancient monuments was then not left to the States. Accordingly, when the Union Powers Committee met and prepared its Report, it also put in the same entry which was there before, namely, ancient and historical monuments, archaeological sites and remains. But, Sir, later, those of the Members who were in the Constituent Assembly, will remember that when this provision was being adopted, the States were rather hesitant to hand over all these powers to the Union Government. They were very insistent that only those monuments which were of national importance should be handed over to the Union Government and that the rest should be left to the control, management and protection of the States. I believe, Sir, they were very right because I find that the Central Government does not necessarily quite often have the proper perspective in respect of the monuments which may be of provincial importance only. We have got the corresponding case of what we call the national histories and the regional histories; a thing may be of national importance and it is bound to be of provincial importance all right, but a thing or personality or an event which is of provincial importance as well. As such, a constant complaint has been there, and some time back when I visited many of these old monuments and sites, I felt and found that some of these monuments were being neglected by the Central Government because the Central Government did not necessarily give that much of importance to these monuments as they were obviously enough not of very great national importance.

Therefore, Sir, the States very rightly insisted that there should be a clear cut demarcation of the different spheres of the Union monuments as distinct from those in the protection of the States and, therefore, the original entry proposed by the Union Powers Committee was duly amended. It was then decided that the monuments to be taken over by the Centre should be individually named by the Parliament. It was felt that the scope of the Union Government and the Central Archaeological Department should be restricted to those monuments only which are thus declared by Parliament to be of national importance. My contention now, Sir, is that this Bill which has been drafted after only ten years of Independence does not necessarily take due note of the possibilities of there being monuments under the protection and control of the State Governments. Therefore, Sir, I find no provision in the Bill for the transfer of the control of the monuments that are now under the Union Government and the Union Archaeological Department to the control of the State Governments and *vice versa*. This possibility is there and this should be duly provided for. I am quite positive that there are or are going to be cases where the monuments now under the protection of the Union Archaeological Department may be handed over back to the private parties. There should be a definite provision that in the case of those monuments which are going to be thus denationalised and may be handed over back to the persons to whom they originally belonged, the State Governments should necessarily be consulted on the subject and they should be offered an opportunity of first refusal in respect of these monuments. I know, Sir, that the State Governments have been very slow and slack in respect of discharging this responsibility of theirs. It is very clearly known that there are only a very few States which have so far passed the necessary legislation on the subject, but I am sure, Sir, that with all the prodding and with all the persuasion and with all the efforts of the Central Education Ministry in this respect, the State Governments will now take proper measures and will pass the necessary legislations in this respect. Therefore, any comprehensive Bill that is to be passed by this House must take due note of all those definite possibilities. In this respect, Sir, I feel that provision should be made in this Bill for the transfer of monuments under the charge of the Central Government to the State Governments or *vice versa* whenever any need is felt that way.

Taking the clue from this matter and going further in this respect, I feel, Sir, that by the Seventh Amendment to the Constitution, we have decided to give the power to the Central Government for declaring any

monument to be of national importance. By that, Sir, we have gone a long way off but, at the same time, I think it is very necessary....

Shri V.K. Dhage (Bombay): Dr. Raghubir Singh may continue in the afternoon, Sir.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Yes, let him finish this sentence.

Dr. Raghubir Singh: What I think, Sir, is that even when we have given the necessary powers, we cannot completely abdicate all the control that we have had so far. Formerly, according to the Constitution of India that was accepted by the Constituent Assembly, every one of the monuments was to be separately named by Parliament. When we have given these powers to the Union Government, we should make it necessary that all those notifications that are issued either accepting or denationalising any of these monuments should be placed on the Table of the two Houses so that....

Mr. Deputy Chairman: You will continue in the afternoon.

The House reassembled After lunch at half past two of the Clock, The Vice-Chairman (Shri M.B. Joshi) in the Chair.

The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Bill, 1957—Contd.

Dr. Raghubir Singh: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, when the House rose I was dealing with the question of the imperative necessity of the notifications, that may be made by the Central Government under clause 4 on the one side and clause 35 on the other, being placed on the Table of both the Houses so that Parliament could have an opportunity to amend, alter or cancel them. Sir, as I pointed out earlier, one of the fundamental facts which emerged from the Constitution of India was that Parliament was given the power to name each and everyone of the monuments which were to be declared to be of national importance. When this power is going to be given now to the Union Government I feel it is very necessary that these notifications should be placed on the Table of both Houses of Parliament so that Parliament could have an opportunity to look into these matters, if it so wishes. I agree that the original procedures as embodied in the Constitution was neither very good nor very convenient. It was a hampering procedure and much inconvenience would have been caused and much harm would have been done to the cause which it was sought to serve, but it is very

necessary now that this power is subject to a proper check and due control by Parliament.

Now, I want to come to another point about the two omissions that have been made in the present Bill but which were there in the original Act of 1904. Firstly, I refer to section 17 in the original Act relating to the power of the Central Government to control traffic in antiquities and, secondly, to sub-section (2) of section 20 also in the original Act. The provisions contained in these two sections do not appear anywhere in the new Bill. I know I will be told that the Act that was passed in 1947, Act XXXI of 1947, the Antiquities Export Control Act, 1947, would be able to cover this need in respect of section 17. I have carefully examined that Act in collaboration with this Bill and I find that at least in one or two matters the provisions contained in section 17 sub-sections (4) and (5) of the original Act have not been covered by any of the provisions here. Then there is the power for search. The Export Control Act does not provide for these two necessary matters.

Then again section 20 (2) declares the ownership of antiquities in the protected areas to be with the Central Government, that provision also does not find a place in this Bill. I think some provisions in respect of these two important matters should be made in this Bill, at least so far as the provisions contained in section 20(2) are concerned, so that no doubt or difficulty could later arise in this respect in future. These two omissions have got to be set right. With regard to the power for search if it is felt that the addition of a provision of that kind in this Bill is not necessary or would be out of place, I should like to have an assurance from the hon. Minister that it may or will be included in a Bill to amend that Act of 1947. I would like to mention in this connection when we are talking...

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Would not clause 23 meet that objection?

Dr. Raghubir Singh: In respect of what, Sir?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Clause 23. That refers to compulsory acquisition of antiquities discovered during the process of excavation.

Dr. Raghubir Singh: Yes; it is true that it provides for that but it does not in any way provide for what I said about section 20(2) which declares that the ownership of antiquities in the protected areas belongs to the Government. If the Government does not want that declaration or that presumption to be made, I would like to have a definite statement from the Government in that respect. I know that after they are discovered the Government would like to purchase them.

The provision in clause 23 will come into operation after excavations have begun. Suppose no regular excavations are begun but somebody by chance finds out some antiquity somewhere in any protected area. Then what is going to be the position of that antiquity which is a chance-find and not discovered as a result of regular excavations?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Clause 26?

Dr. Raghbir Singh: No. I do not think that clause will serve the required purpose. Sir, it is just for this reason that I am pressing the Government to accede to my request for having a Select Committee, so that we need not enter into a debate here on every one of these important details.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Sir, he is raising certain objections and I am only trying to point out that those objections are met by certain clauses. Clause 26 for instance relates to the purchase of antiquities by the Central Government.

Dr. Raghbir Singh: Well, this clause 26 is a reproduction of the old section 19. What I am saying is that the old Act had both section 19 as well as the provisions under sub-section (2) of section 20. If it was redundant, it would not have been there. At least I think the drafting of the Acts in the old days was much better and much more precise.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: That is a matter of opinion which is questionable.

Dr. Raghbir Singh: I am not saying this is bad; I am only saying they were better.

Now, when we are talking of these antiquities etc., a very major question comes up and that major question is about having properly trained archaeologists and archaeological officers. For instance, we have laid down in clause 24 that no State Government shall undertake or authorise any person to undertake any excavation except with the previous approval of the Central Government and in accordance with some rules or directions. Now, all these rules and directions cannot possibly be followed unless and until we have got trained archaeological officers or persons who know all this job. Now, Sir, I have got with me here a Report of the Central Advisory Board of Archaeology where the hon. the Education Minister himself has said that he has felt this need as early as 1947 and he had been assured by the Director-General at that time that the Department was fully equipped to start such a school. I am still wondering what has stood in the way of that desire being fulfilled. It is eleven years now and I do not know if anything is being done in this respect. A few trainees may have been given some training

but the question of having a regular training school has not been taken up. When we are going to insist that the private excavators or the State excavators should do this work under certain rules and according to a certain definite system, it is very necessary that we should have trained experts for the purpose.

Then, Sir, I want to come to another question. It is more of administrative detail rather than about this enactment. When we are talking about archaeological monuments and their preservation another very major question comes and that is the question of their proper renovation and proper preservation. I think many hon. Members in the House would be remembering the famous story of a talk between a lawyer and a medical doctor — not one like me. The doctor happened to see a certain person going about in rags and he asked his friend, the lawyer, “Who is he?” He said, “He is the result of my failure. I appeared on his behalf and I could not win his case.” The doctor said, “Well! so that shows your inefficiency.” The lawyer turned round and said, “My failure walks on the ground, your failures are buried under the ground.” The doctor’s failure is buried under the ground and so he does not remain alive to give reply or tell about the failure of the doctor. So, Sir, I was now reminded of it as the failures and mistakes of archaeologists and excavationists only disappear. As Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray mentioned about it the other day, very much damage has been done by the amateur excavationist, and now this work of excavation has become a serious and a very technical affair. In this connection, I have got to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister what has appeared in a newspaper. A report has appeared in the “Statesman” of November 29, 1957. It is a letter written by an ex-custodian of ancient monuments. I do not know how far it is true or incorrect, but it does lay down quite a few serious charges about the way the ancient monuments are being renovated or maintained. It says: “In South India ugly pavements, partly of stone, have been inflicted on the 8th century temple of Kailasanatha at Conjeevaram.” Now, Sir, there is another thing. I hear that there has been a good deal of vandalism in Sanchi during the years 1953-54. I understand that a departmental enquiry was made in respect of these and some adverse findings were made by the enquiring officer. The findings were adverse on certain officers, still no action was taken. Then, again, I understand that the brick path of the famous monastery at Nalanda was destroyed and then during the preparations for the Buddha Jayanthi, there was put in a new pavement of modern bricks. Then, Sir, there is another instance, not very far from here. I understand there was some trouble

during the renovation that was going on with the tomb of Rahim Khankhana. A report was submitted by the officer concerned in 1956 that a railing has been put up while the renovation was being done. The payment was made in respect of the railing that was supposed to have been put up. And when it was discovered that there was no railing at all, later the railing actually had to be made and put up. That shows that there may sometimes be such cases where there are certain very serious administrative lapses. In this respect I only want to make a humble suggestion, for the consideration of the Minister, now that they have adopted the system of departmental repairs in respect of these ancient and historical monuments. I know that sometimes in some respects the system of departmental repairs is very good and is the only thing to be desired. But it has got its own weaknesses also. If any departmental repairs are made and if things go wrong, or if there are any mistake committed it becomes a question of departmental prestige, and there is bound to be a tendency in the department to white-wash it, gloss over it, pass it over or overlook it completely. Therefore, I would suggest to the hon. Minister that certain definite steps be taken so that any such possibilities which might lead to certain embarrassments in future or certain serious charges in this respect may be avoided.

Finally I want to bring to the notice of the Minister a small thing. My hon. colleague here, Mr. Amolakh Chand, raised the question of the list of these monuments. I think the other day when he was speaking here, when the question was being debated here, he said: "The monuments mentioned in the Schedules of the various Acts are those which have been accepted by the Government of India but there are other monuments about which the Government of India have not taken any decision." And he asked for a complete list of the monuments that have been taken into Government's protection. If I mistake not, I think they number nearly four thousand in all. Again, the hon. Minister the other day happened to mention that some list has been given in the Act of 1951 and in its subsequent amendments. But this does not necessarily contain all those monuments that were taken over or were declared to be protected monuments prior to 1947, which were situated in the former British Indian Provinces or which were situated in the later so-called Part C States. It is very necessary that the list should be completed. Once or twice I think I asked a question and the hon. Minister said that the list was under preparation. May I hope, now that the hon. Minister has produced a comprehensive Bill, that he would also produce a comprehensive Bill, that he would also produce a

comprehensive and complete list, because that would give us an idea as to exactly what monuments are now being protected and what monuments out of them can and should be retained therein for the future as well?

In conclusion, I would like once again to press the point that by passing this Bill and especially some of its provisions the House has been called upon to give certain powers to the Government of India. We do not in any way hesitate to give the powers; but at the same time the House would very much like to have retained the power of being given an opportunity to have a look into these notifications. We here in this House represent the States. As I mentioned before, it was from the point of view of the States, that it was then considered most essential that there should be a States' list also and the States should be allowed an opportunity to have their say and also to have their own archaeological department. Under these circumstances on behalf of the States that we represent, on behalf of the continuous stand that the States have all along taken in this respect, I press my hon. friend that on this point at least he may concede. These are all points of detail. As I said before, the question of revenue powers and the powers that are intended to be given to the revenue and archaeological officers may have to be looked into carefully. We do not grudge giving those powers, but we do not want at the same time that the powers should in any place in any way be misused. Now, all these details have got to be carefully looked into and need to be examined in close collaboration with the hon. Minister and his officers. We do not want in any way to place any hindrances in the path of the future, but, Sir, at the same time we have to see that the powers that we give are not ever misused. It is for this reason that I would once again press my hon. friend, the Minister, that he may concede to our suggestion, though the request has come very late, that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee and if he so prefers, to a Joint Select Committee so that all the points that I have raised and those raised by my other friends may be thrashed out in detail and a Bill be put on the Statute Book which may be in every way a fit successor to what Lord Curzon did before, and then posterily will be every grateful to this Parliament and to the Minister who piloted it now.

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee (Nominated): Sir, I rise to support this Bill. It has been long called for and appears to be a comprehensive piece of legislation by which the conflicting and overlapping obligations of the State Governments and the Central Government may be reconciled so that the monuments which are most important for historical purposes and which are also artistic treasures may be properly conserved.

At present this object of protection of monuments suffers to some extent on account of the ambiguities as regards the liabilities and obligations of two different sets of authorities, Central and the State. For the present I am confining myself only to propose a sort of a running commentary on some of the points and provisions of the Bill so that it may be considered for what it is worth, but I have gone rather deeply into the vocabulary of this Bill and also some of the principles upon which it is founded. For instance, the very title of the Bill, I think, may be somewhat modified, though the modification proposed is very slight and verbal. It says: "A Bill to provide for the preservation of ancient and historical monuments..." etc. My first suggestion is that "preservation" applies to life. We are all familiar with the problem of preservation of wild life on which a conference was being held. The word "preservation" applies to life, and the word "conservation" applies to inanimate objects like dead monuments and dead antiquities. So far as I remember the father of Indian archaeology or the Indian Archaeological Department was Lord Curzon, and I think he specifically used the technical term "conservation". I think there is no harm if for the sake of purity of Queen's English we replace the word "preservation" by "conservation". So, my suggestion is "to provide for the conservation of ancient and historical monuments and archaeological sites and remains of national importance" etc. That is suggestion number one. Here also I find that some fundamental principle is involved in the word "national". In this very Bill, if you refer to clause 16 sub-clause (1), at page 8, you contemplate that a protected monument which is a place of worship or shrine shall not be used for any purpose inconsistent with its character, and in sub-clause (2) it is said: a monument that is used for religious worship or observances by any community etc. If you, therefore, contemplate within the purview of this Bill the question of the conservation of shrines or temples which are still used as places of worship, then certainly you cannot say that these particular temples are monuments of national importance. I suggest that it will be better if you had used the words "monuments of historical all-India importance". I do not think that the word "national" should be used in the same sense in which in the Constitution the term is used as regards national interests. You remember that the Central Government can intervene in the sphere of State Legislation where it is convinced that some purpose involving national interest is to be declared as the subject of national interest.

Then I have also certain fundamental considerations to urge before the Minister on this question. As you know, art in India has been

always denominational and religious in character. There is no artistic monument which can be considered as national in the real sense of the term, namely that it is venerated by followers of all religions. It is not so because every religion has at its service monuments of artistic importance and monuments which directly minister to the religious needs of a particular community or denomination concerned.

In this connection I should like to say that Indian art was rather late in its growth on account of this connection of art with religion. So far as Vedic religion was concerned, Vedic religion was obsessed by the contemplation of the formless Infinite, worship of Arupa Brahma, devoid of forms, the Infinite, beyond all forms or visible shape. Therefore, where the worship centres round the conception of Brahma, the Infinite, there is no occasion, no thought for the cultivation of art in the proper sense of the term, so that there is no example of any kind of art in the Vedic age for the simple reason that the fundamental point in the religion of the Vedas did not at all encourage the idea of worshipping the Infinite in terms of form or colour or shape.

Then, when you come to the rise of Buddhism in 500 B.C., you find that that great man, the Buddha, is one of the greatest characters known in history. He banned his own portraiture. He would not allow his worshippers and followers to have any kind of portrait by which he may be represented in flesh and blood.

An Hon. Member: What about his statues?

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee: I will come to that. This ban existed for about two or three centuries and therefore Indian art, properly speaking, was so late in development on Indian soil. Why? Because, as I said, art was directly connected with religion and Buddha would not permit any kind of portraiture of his personality, because he said in a most noble manner that "I do not like my disciples to show respect to me. They should show me respect by following the teaching for which I stand, the truths which I preached". The truth counts more than the seeker of truth, and therefore such a noble idea of religion was cultivated. There you do not find the soil that is congenial for the growth of any artistic conception. Now you may ask: How was it that Buddhist art at all began? I think that the Indian art may have some origins in certain colossal over-sized statues of Yakshas or Yakshis. The cult of Yakshas is not part of orthodox Hinduism or Buddhism. Among the various statues of Pre-Mauryan times you have the famous Parkham statue of Yakshi. Now in those days popular worship centred round all these minor godlings — Yakshas and Yakshis. And the popular religious

demand was that there must be some kind of visible symbols or forms of worship, and in that way the first religious image was evolved probably about 400 B.C. But that was not very widely popular. It was only confined to a few places where you find examples of colossal images of minor deities of Hinduism. But so far as the main deities of Hinduism are concerned, I think the earliest example of the development of Indian art may be traced only to the time of Ashoka. It was only left to Ashoka to have thought of decorating this country by means of its supremely artistic structures and monuments. But even there is no portraiture of the Buddha permitted at all because Ashoka, the devout follower of Buddha could not go against his express injunction by admitting a portraiture of Buddha in any form. What did he do? He only tried to put before the people some recollections of the Buddha in the form of symbols or tokens which might serve as a reminder of his existence. Therefore, although the form of Buddha was not at all produced, the Buddha was worshipped in some of his symbols such as his footprints or his head-dress or the great stupa or the Bodhi Tree under which he attained enlightenment. These symbols have been very well repeated in the art of Ashoka. Then the masterpiece of Ashokan art in those days was that famous pillar of Saranath which inspired our national emblem. But even there the Buddha was worshipped in the symbol. The symbol used by Ashoka was the Wheel of Religion or Dharm-Chakra which was first turned by the Great Buddha on the field of Saranath, and the Pali text describes this great work of the Buddha as the first preaching of his new religion by the sloka 'Dharma-Chakra Pravartana Sutra'. This Sutra describes the Buddha first turning the wheel of righteousness. Therefore, in that sense Ashoka only tried to make visible the text of this Pali discourse. He reduced into the terms of visible and tangible stone the sacred words of the Buddha used in that Pali text. So what did he give to the country? He gave a beautiful monument which did not contain directly any figure of the Buddha, but only the most important point about Buddha's life and work, namely, his religion. That religion is symbolised by the Wheel. And then the essence of Buddhism was the religion of non-violence, the doctrine of non-violence. And that also was preached by Ashoka in a most artistic way, namely by the wheel of righteousness that was placed on the shoulders of the four big lions. There the lion is a symbol of brute force and the wheel is a symbol of spiritual force.

Shri Sonusing Dhansing Patil (Bombay): May I know, Sir, what is the point which my hon. friend is trying to make?

The Vice-Chairman (Shri M.B. Joshi): What are you particularly driving at?

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee: My argument is too subtle perhaps. My point is that the word 'national' will never apply to any artistic monuments. But only the Ashokan monument may be regarded as of national importance because Ashoka has placed before us the symbols of universal religious principles in a visible form.

Now, I must come back to my main point. The point is this that this religion of the Buddha did receive an artistic expression in the Ashokan monument, namely that the spiritual force is superior to the force of violence. Buddhism stood for the force of law as against the law of force, if I may say so. And therefore, that symbolism is really a work of national importance. And this phrase 'national importance', I am afraid, has to be slightly changed so that there may not be any kind of misapprehension about it.

Shri B.B. Sharma (Uttar Pradesh): What about "Taj"? Will it be of national importance?

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee: Well, I was coming to that also. Now, Sir, the Taj is not at all connected with religion. As a piece of artistic monument it is of national importance, that is to say, it is an object in which all communities interested in art show their concern. (*Interruption*). It may be an Islamic monument, but on account of its universal artistic features, it is acclaimed by all communities as of national importance.

Then, I come to another point with regard to clause 2 (a). Here you have mentioned the words "structure, erection or monument or any tumulus or place of internment", etc. But there is one most important omission, namely, 'painting'. I would request that 'painting' should certainly and expressly be enumerated in this sub-clause. The Ajanta paintings require very much expense for their proper conservation, and therefore painting is as much a monument of importance as any other monument like sculpture or inscription.

Similarly, in clause 2(b)(i) you have mentioned the words "any coin, sculpture, manuscript", etc. Here also I should like the word 'painting' to be included.

Then everywhere I find that the words 'of national importance' have been repeated. Then again on page 4 the wording is: "Preservation of protected monument by agreement". Here also I should like the word 'conservation' to be used.

Then, I come to page 8. I do not know but perhaps the hon. Minister will be able to correct me if I am wrong. I think that under the old regulations, any living temple where worship is still being offered is not regarded as coming within the purview of the Archaeological Department. Living temples where there are worshippers every day coming to offer worship, such temples should not be under the control of a secular department like the Archaeological Department.

Shri Kishen Chand: There is a clause for joint guardianship, joint ownership.

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji: Under the older regulations, I find that any temple, living temple, where popular worship is still offered, is not subject to the control of the Archaeological Department.

Dr. Raghubir Sinh: Clause 16 is more or less a repetition of the old section 13.

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee: Here it is expressly stated: "A protected monument....under this Act which is a place of worship or shrine" etc. I think this is a contradiction in terms. Archaeology means something antiquated, something which is not in use. A temple is a domain of living worship, and how can you trespass upon that domain?

Shri B.B. Sharma: Does the hon. Member mean to say that a temple which is 2000 years old but is still used for worship should not be taken care of by the State?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I should like to draw the attention of the hon. Member to section 13 of the 1904 Act. The hon. Member was asking whether such a place could be protected. Section 13 reads as follows:

"A place of worship or shrine maintained by the Government under this Act shall not be used for any purpose inconsistent with its character."

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee: That is true, but you categorically say here that a protected monument can be a place of worship.

Shri B.B. Sharma: Why not?

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee: By looking after a temple you encroach upon the domain of religious practice. I do not see how a secular State has any business with shrines and temples which are still used by the public for purposes of worship. This is a fundamental consideration and I think you had better consult the proper authorities on this. By looking after a monument used for religious worship or observance, you will be encroaching upon the field of religious practice

of a community, and there may be untoward events happening. Therefore, I say that these words may be slightly modified. Our purpose is a very noble one, because we do not want these monuments to crumble.

Shri B.B. Sharma: Does he mean to say that temples cannot be looked after by the State?

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee: Living temples are maintained by the worshippers. Wherever a temple is not in use, then you can say that you are concerned with its conservation as a monument.

Shri Kishen Chand: No.

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee: 'No' means what? A temple like the Vishwanath Temple has been existing for centuries. Would you declare the Vishwanath Temple as a protected monument? You must come to grips with the practical realities.

Shri H.P. Saxena (Uttar Pradesh): You do not have a correct conception of the whole thing.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I may inform the hon. Member that there are hundreds of living monuments which are under the protection of the Government of India at the present moment.

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee: That is what I wanted to know, but I still think there must be a line of demarcation between a temple or shrine which is still used as a living institution where worship is offered by thousands of the community concerned, and others which are not so. If you declare a living temple or shrine as an archaeological monument...

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The hon. Member is certainly aware that monuments which are not under protection tend to be neglected and gradually they crumble. It is only through protection that they can be looked after.

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee: That should be the criterion. If a temple is deserted and not being looked after by the community concerned, there you have every reason for interference. Then you declare it to be a secular monument and that it should be controlled by the Archaeological Department.

Shri B.B. Sharma: What about the Khajuraho Temple? People should not go and worship there?

Dr. Raghubir Singh: The Moti Masjid in Agra. It is a protected monument but still worship is being conducted there.

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee: Why should they ask me for my views? I am raising only a question of administration. The question is....

(Interruptions)

The Vice-Chairman (Shri M.B. Joshi): This is not a debating society where any one can stand up and interrupt. I would like therefore that the member who is speaking must go speaking. I would not allow any further interruptions.

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee: Thank you. The point that I raise is a fundamental one, and I think that the Government would be well-advised to consider the best solution of this problem. It is my idea that a temple which is still a living institution, where worship is daily offered by a community belonging to that religion, should not be brought under the purview of the Archaeological Department. Its maintenance must be left to the devotion of the community concerned. It is not the business of the State to do it. The State cannot have any kind of denominational predilections. All these difficulties about prohibiting the entry of any person not entitled to enter any monument or part thereof used for religious worship or observances by any community, etc. will disappear if we just define the fundamental principles on the basis of which the Archaeological Department can intervene and conserve these old decaying or crumbling monuments. Clause 18 talks of the right of access of the public to any protected monument, and there seems to be some inconsistency between this and clause 16 (2) (a).

Now, coming to the marketability of antiquities, there are questions raised as to the value of these antiquities, but I think that this question need not trouble the administration because the administration knows that there is a very brisk market for the Indian artistic antiquities. Americans are ready to pay fabulous prices for these, and therefore the market value will depend upon the taste of the purchaser, so that it cannot be normalised. It is in a sense, an abnormal market. Then at page 12, clause 30, I would like to again add the word 'painting' so that it may read "any sculpture, carving, image, bas-relief, inscription and painting". Then in para (2) it says, "Any person who moves any...." I suppose it should be 'removes'. I don't know whether I am correct. There is some subtlety of legal phraseology. I don't know whether it is correct or not. Then at page 13, clause 35, an ambiguous phrase is used—"a monument that has ceased to be of national importance." I don't know how it can be so. It may cease to be of national importance if it ceases to exist but if it does exist and if it was one possessed of national character, then I don't know how you can have this idea that it ceases to be of national importance.

Although I have appeared to be somewhat of a carping critic, it is farthest from my intention to raise any kind of opposition to this very wholesome measure by which Government would be able to protect not merely the historical monuments that are of importance as sources of our national history but also monuments which are appreciated all over the world as treasures of art which are possessed of a universal appeal and therefore I say that our national Government is very well justified in regularising these functions connected with a most important branch of our national life.

Shri Kishen Chand: Sir, I wholeheartedly welcome this Bill and as has been pointed out by many hon. Members, though belated, it is most welcome and if I go through this Bill in detail — in a very short time I will finish it — will be with the sole idea or object of making some suggestions for improvement. I know that the hon. Minister has given very careful thought to it but it is quite possible that some ideas may have been left and I may be able to make some suggestions.

I don't want to refer to the controversy raised by Dr. Mookerjee and I think he has got great force in his argument about the word 'preservation' and 'national'. I leave it for experts of the English language to decide it, but the whole purpose of this Bill is for the preservation of ancient and historical monuments etc.

There is a feeling all over the country that we have a very nice Bill but as far as preservation of monuments is concerned, whether it is due to lack of funds or other causes, the preservation is not being carried on as well as it should be. I particularly point out the example of the Ramappa Temple or the thousand-pillar temple in the Warangal District. There are things of very great antiquity or historical importance — of course they have been brought under monuments of national importance — but the Department is not looking after them properly and they are slowly and gradually decaying. I come to even more important things like the Ellora and Ajanta. It requires a great deal of money. Now, 50 years back, when it was under the Hyderabad State, the then Finance Minister, Sir Akbar Hydari, spent a very large amount and brought certain Italian experts to renovate some of the old paintings and preserve them. I maintain that our Archaeological Department at present is not paying as much attention to the Ellora and Ajanta and various other antiquities which extend to 1,000 years or beyond that period. Most of the attention is paid to monuments only 300 or 400 years old. I don't know why there is this partiality that antiquities of only 400 or 500 years receive greater attention from the Department than those of 1,000 years or beyond.

Shri V.K. Dhage (Bombay): The hon. Minister has not caught your point.

Shri Kishen Chand: He has understood that older monuments require greater attention and more expense on them because they are in an inferior condition of preservation. They are of greater antiquity and naturally their condition is much worse and so more money and attention are required to preserve them and I do hope the hon. Minister will pay due attention to them, in particular, to Ellora, Ajanta, the Ramappa Temple and various others. I don't agree with the previous speaker who said that places of present worship should not be brought under the protected monuments. This Bill really covers two things. There are archaeological monuments which are of historical importance but they are not places of worship but there are large number of places of worship both in South India and North India whether they are of Hindu or Muslim religion—which have to be preserved. Of course, the ownership and the Government wants to preserve them, there should be absolutely no objection. We should welcome it if any monument which is used as a place of worship is protected by the Government and the Government is prepared to spend money on its preservation. But I suppose there was some misunderstanding.

Now, I come to the various clauses of this Bill. I don't see why 100 years have been selected. In all the clauses the definition of antiquity has been defined as anything which is 100 years or over old.

Shri H.P. Saksena: Because human life is supposed to be covered by 100 years only.

Shri Kishen Chand: If you take the biblical age, it will be 70. I don't know which idea has been taken by the hon. Member, but I feel certain that there is absolutely no need for putting down a limitation of 100 years. There can be works of art, fine statues etc.—not the British statues for which an hon. Member has sent in an amendment, but other statues—representative of Indian culture which the Government may like to preserve. I would therefore request the Minister not to hem himself in by this limitation of 100 years. If you go really by the words “old, antiquity” the words give you an impression that it should be at least 1,000 years. If you want to come down to 100 years, why keep this restriction of 100 years? It is quite possible that even after the last Mutiny of 1857 which we should call as the War of Freedom, after that, there may have been a monument erected in the memory of the heroes of 1857 and if we want to preserve that, I don't see why the Department should not take control of that and care for that.

Then I come to clause 3 and 4. I agree that these really refer to giving notice to the public that such and such monument has been declared as a monument of national importance but as was pointed out by the previous speaker, why is it that at a subsequent stage, there is a likelihood of a monument being declared not to be of national importance? What situation can arise where a monument which has once been declared to be of national importance can be relegated to the condition that it does not enjoy that importance?

Dr. Raghunath Singh: Correcting a mistake.

Shri Kishen Chand: Then I come to clause 5 which refers to a particular monument where there is some joint ownership and in particular I refer to sub-clause 4 of clause 5. It reads as follows:

“When the Director-General has accepted the guardianship of a monument under sub-section (3), the owner shall, except as expressly provided in this Act, have the same estate, right, title and interest in and to the monument as if the Director-General had not been constituted a guardian thereof.”

These sub-clauses — sub-clause 3 and 4 — really relate to monuments which are places of worship. Of course, they can relate to other things also, but principally they relate to places of worship. An hon. Member gave the example of Moti Masjid. Another example is that of several temples of South India, which are places of worship even now. I personally think that the ownership of these monuments should rest with the community which is worshipping there. The Director-General should only come in as a helper, not as a guardian, just for protecting the monuments, for repairs to the monuments. There will be subtle difference, if he becomes the owner, then there will be the question of difference of opinion.

Dr. K.L. Shrivastava: I may inform the hon. Member that if he would look into the Act of 1904, he would find that this is not a new provision that we have brought in. The only change we have effected is that from the collector, this power is now given to the Director-General. I just wanted to inform him that such a provision is already there in the 1904 Act.

Shri Kishen Chand: I quite believe that it may be in the Act of 1904. But the hon. Minister is bringing forward this Bill in 1958 under circumstances where we have a national Government and in a national Government we want to care for the sentiments and the susceptibilities of the people of our country and of the people who are

worshipping in these temples. In 1904, it was Lord Curzon and he looked at it from an outsider's point of view, of just wanting to protect the monuments and of preserving them. But we are now the citizens of this country; it is our heritage and these are our monuments. Therefore, our outlook should be a little different. I am not to be convinced by the argument that a similar provision existed in the Act of 1904, and therefore there should be one in this Bill now also. Therefore, I continue to maintain that the ownership should continue to rest with the community or the section or the sect of the people who have been utilising this as a place of worship. The Director-General or anybody else should only come in as a helper. The difference will be that if there is a sort of a joint ownership to regulate the coming and going into the place of worship, to regulate the hours of worship and the maintenance of the interior portion of this place of worship according to the rules laid down by the Director-General, I do not want that. I want, for instance, that in the case of Moti Masjid, the rules regarding worship, the rules regarding the maintenance of and entry into the mosque must be regulated by the people worshipping in the Moti Masjid only. Regarding the outside preservation part, where it becomes a protected monument and you want to protect the outside so that it does not deteriorate, there the Director-General's function comes in. Similarly, in the case of the temples, I do not want it to be declared that, since they are protected monuments, therefore the Director-General may have the power to control and regulate the admission and non-admission of people into these places of worship, places where actually worship is going on.

Next, I come to the purchase of land etc. that is to say, clause 6(2) (e), where it is laid down:

“the notice to be given to the Central Government in case the land on which the monument is situated or any adjoining land is offered for sale by the owner, and the right to be reserved to the Central Government to purchase such land, or any specified portion of such land, at its market value.”

But as hon. Members know, some time back when permission was granted to foreigners to purchase things in the United Kingdom, so many things of art were bodily taken away from the United Kingdom and they were rebuilt in the United States of America and preserved there. So, if we just go by the market value and permit other people to come in and bid, difficulties will arise, and sometimes the prices may go up so high that the Central Government may not be able to pay.

Therefore, we have to be on our guard, and I feel that the words "market value" should not be there in this provision. It should be "fair price". You cannot leave it as "market value". Suppose, there is a coin for instance, of great antiquity. Its intrinsic value, if it is a gold coin, may be only a few rupees, but its market value may be a thousand rupees or even a lakh of rupees if it is such a rare coin. Similarly, with various other articles. For instance, just now there is an excavation work going on in Rupar and so many things are being dug out. When excavation work was done in Egypt, there was a law or convention that a certain percentage of the finds from the excavations would be taken by the people doing the excavations and only the remaining part kept by the Government owning that area. Similarly, here also we should have a rule. When you give the permission to do the excavation work, there should be a strict and detailed set of rules to the effect that any finds from the excavation cannot be taken away by the excavator. It is not the property of the excavator at all, and there is no question of any compensation or any market value being paid to him. The excavator should merely excavate. A foreigner or an outsider will not acquire any right on the excavations, on what he digs out. There should be a clause to that effect and I fail to see it here. I might have missed it in my reading of the Bill. I would like the introduction of such a clause to the effect that no find out of any excavations in India should be taken out of India; that will automatically become the property of the Government of India and there is no question of any market value.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Clause 23 makes that provision.

Shri Kishen Chand: I have already read clause 23.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: It is compulsory purchase.

Shri Kishen Chand: But there is no question of any purchase. My contention is that you give permission to the man to excavate on the specific understanding that all the finds will automatically become the property of the Central Government and there is no question of any compensation. I would go a step further and say that they are our national assets. Out of their love of archaeology, foreigners may come to do the excavation work. I may give the specific example of Egypt. There, nearly 40 or 50 years ago when the Great Tut-ankh-amen tombs were found, rare things were taken out and nearly half of them were taken away by the excavators.

Shri H.D. Rajah (Madras): What about a pot of gold discovered from the excavation?

Shri Kishen Chand: That does not concern us here. Here it is a question strictly of archaeological finds and so, that question does not arise here. To deal with such a find there are the ordinary laws of the country. It may belong to the owner of the land and there are ordinary laws for that. Here we are interested only in finds which are of archaeological value and for those cases I want this condition to be imposed.

Shri V.K. Dhage: Very reasonable.

Shri Kishen Chand: Therefore, I say there is no question of any market value at all.

In the matter of a monument and the purchase of the land adjacent to the monument, we may want to acquire that land because we think the monument can have a better approach or the monument can have a little extra space for certain purposes, and so on. There you can have fair price. The land near a monument has a certain value because so many people visit it. If it is sold, people can put up shops there and people visiting the monument will do shopping there and therefore its value will go up. Therefore I do not want to use the words "market value" but only the words "fair price".

This work of excavation is a most difficult one and it requires a great deal of experience and knowledge. In our case most of these excavations relate really to periods which are nearly 1,500 or 2,000 years back. These excavations are almost at par with the excavations in Egypt. There also, the antiquity is very great. For some time past, there are certain excavations going on in Israel of very great antiquity. The Governments of these countries have become very alert. I have a feeling that our hon. Minister here has been over-awed by the Act of 1904 and has copied most of the parts from the 1904 Act. The world of India has changed from 1904 and our outlook should be slightly different. In the matter of excavations, we should be exceedingly cautious. We should not first of all permit any excavation without being fully satisfied that the people who are undertaking that job are experienced people, that they know their job and that they will be doing justice to the excavation work.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN *in the Chair.*]

I want all those clauses which relate to excavation to be changed entirely. I want much greater protection to be given to the places of excavation and permits for excavation work should be given only to people who have long experience of this kind of work.

As has been mentioned earlier, there is no mention in this bill about paintings, about coins and so on. We have mostly restricted ourselves to sculptures, carvings and all the other things we have covered by "and other like objects". Now, the word "like" is a very curious one. If the word "like" means that they are connected with sculptures and carvings, then I think this is insufficient. I want to cover up all the coins and pottery also. Now, all ancient potteries that come out of excavations cannot be covered by this Bill literally. The Bill as it stands relates only to monuments and sculptures and carvings and other like objects. Why should you not include in it pottery? The whole of the Rupar find consists of potteries and if you do not include any such thing in the Bill, at least the preamble should be slightly extended by another one line in which, besides sculptures, carvings, potteries and so many other things like coins, etc., should be added on.

I have already said, Sir, I cannot understand as to how a monument once declared to be of national importance could lose its importance subsequently and be denotified. Of course, if it completely topples down and nothing remains on the site, it can no longer be a monument but then in that contingency, I do not see any reason why you want to denotify it. That contingency does not require any such provision as the one you have made in clause 35. It is a thing which does not exist and naturally it goes away.

I now come to the question of vandalism in regard to our antiquities. I was very much pained to hear that in the Taj, at the time of the full moon, the people who used to visit there took away the precious stones and other inlaid work. I think, Sir, our Government is taking enough steps to protect these monuments against acts of vandalism such as taking away these precious stones or engraving the name of the people who visit these sites or engraving their dates of visit.

Lastly, Sir, I have a suggestion to make. If you go to Ellora and Ajanta, you will find, Sir, that in almost all the sculptures, in every statue, either the nose is cut or the hand is cut or the breasts are cut. All these things continue to remind us that during the medieval times, during the 13th, 14th and the 15th centuries, these places of ancient and historical monuments were visited by people who had no regard for such things. They had removed the arms, noses or breasts. I had a talk with certain experts to find out whether it will not be practicable to use modern methods of cement and plaster, with colour mixed up, to restore the previous shape of the noses, etc. If we see a statue, we should know the idea behind that statue. We do not want to go there to see an

incomplete statue, and come back cursing all the time the people who visited these places and struck off the noses or the arms. I want to know whether that sort of thing will be possible for the Archaeological Department to do and I also want to know whether our great Archaeologists have thought about this question of renovating our old statues with the help of cement, plaster of Paris and various other things. We cannot certainly put stone there but we can add on with these things. I would request the hon. Minister to very carefully consider this question, place this before his Board, to find out whether it is practicable and advisable to restore all our old statues and monuments to their original shape where an act of vandalism has removed a portion.

Thank you, Sir.

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: Sir, before I deal with the various points that have been raised by hon. Members, I should like to express my feelings of gratitude to the Members who have participated in this debate. I do admit that there has been some delay in bringing this Bill, but in order that we might have a comprehensive legislation we had to examine this matter from various aspects and I am very happy that the House in general has welcomed this measure.

I should like to deal with some of the points which have been raised by hon. Members. My friend, Mr. Rajah, who is not here, raised the objection that the Central Government should take over the full responsibility with regard to the maintenance and preservation of monuments and there was no need to ask the State Governments to enact their legislations. The whole purpose of this Bill is that we wish to be clear about the responsibilities of the Central Government and the State Government and the State Governments as far as the monuments are concerned. The Constitution makes provision for both the Centre as well as the States to take responsibility of the monuments which are of national importance and which are of local importance and the whole purpose of this Bill is to avoid that overlapping of jurisdiction between the Centre and the State Governments. It was with that purpose that this Bill has been brought forward. We wish to be clear about the demarcation of responsibilities. In our country since we have a rich cultural heritage, we have thousands of monuments which need protection. They are our national treasure. Whether it is the State Government or Central Government which looks after them, these must be protected. If the Central Government has to take responsibility for all the monuments, it is physically impossible to manage. It is therefore proposed that as far as protection of national monuments is

concerned, that must be the responsibility of the Central Government, and the protection of monuments which are of local importance – there are thousands of them – should be the responsibility of the State Governments.

Sir, my friend, Shri Rajah, raised a strong protest against the statues which are connected with the British rule. In this matter I think my friend, Dr. Ray, has dealt with some of the points. It will not help us in any way to do away with or to wipe out the whole history which is connected with the British rule. We should have a proper historical perspective with regard to these statues. I would of course, like to assure the hon. Member that it is our policy to remove all those statues which offend our national sentiment. The Government have already removed certain statues, and gradually other statues also which offend our national sentiment will be removed. But we do not want to make too much fuss about it. We do not want to create ill-will. That has not been in our culture, and certainly there is no sense in attempting to wipe out the whole history of hundred years of British rule. At the same time I would like to assure the hon. Member that we have been taking steps to remove all those statues which are offensive to our national sentiment.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Remove those statues and put them in a chamber of horrors.

Shri H.D. Rajah: Make them into electric wires for the Five Year Plan.

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: My friend, Mr. Rajah, also suggested that clause 6 (3) of the Bill should be removed. The point raised by Mr. Rajah is covered by the amendment which we are proposing to clause 6 (3). Under that the owner of any monument will become liable to refund to the Department of Archaeology any expenditure incurred by them over the monument, in those cases where the mutual agreement is proposed to be terminated by the owner of the monument. I think with that amendment the position will be made clear.

Shri H.D. Rajah: You are moving an amendment to that effect?

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: Yes. In regard to clause 9 of the Bill Mr. Rajah said that it would prove ineffective in practice and that the Department of Archaeology should aim at securing agreement with the owner of the monument through negotiation. Here also I would like to assure the hon. Member that as far as possible the Government will adopt the policy of negotiation, and they will try to reach an agreement which will be mutually acceptable to both the parties. Compulsion will be taken

recourse to only as a last resort. The House would certainly not like the monuments to be destroyed on account of neglect or on account of any selfish motives, and it is only as a last resort that this provision has been made.

Shri Bhanj Deo did not refer to any particular item of the Bill, but he made certain references to Government not taking over the Yogini Chakras in Orissa and Madras which are being neglected. He also said that there were numerous temples relating to the Tel Valley civilisation in Orissa which were not taken care of by the Department. With regard to Orissa, there are a number of ancient monuments which have to be protected, and obviously it is not possible for the Central Government to take over all the monuments; some monuments will have to be looked after by the State Government. But I shall certainly examine that question as soon as I receive the list from Shri Bhanj Deo which he has promised to send.

Some Members also raised the question with regard to the list of monuments. Now, the number of protected monuments and sites is 3,612. In certain cases there is only a single entry which sometimes includes several buildings. The actual number of monuments would be much more than the figure indicated.

Sir, various Members referred to this compulsory acquisition of monuments. In various cases the Government have been trying to negotiate with the private parties. For example, in regard to the Lingaraj Temple at Bhubaneswar and the Brihadiswara Temple at Tanjore, Government have been trying to negotiate for the last ten years. Sometimes even after such long negotiations it has not been possible to persuade the owner to enter into an agreement. It is only in such cases that Government would exercise that power. Otherwise, the policy that we propose to adopt even in future is that of negotiation. I might also inform the House that the Department is engaged at the present moment in a wide inspection of all the monuments which are of national importance, and after this inspection has been done the whole list will be revised. The monuments which should not have been in the list will be removed from that list, and the monuments which should be added to the list of protected monuments will be added. This, of course, is expected to take nearly two years, and we shall be in a position to complete that work after that inspection is done.

My friend, Dr. Raghubir Singh, raised the objection that there was no arrangement for placing the notification on the Table of the House. Sir, the clause lays down that a preliminary notification will be put up

in the official gazette, and after considering all objections the Government after a period of two months will declare a monument to be of national importance, and then the official notification will be issued. It is not necessary to place that list on the Table of the House because it will all be in the official gazette. If the hon. Member wishes that Parliament should have an opportunity to discuss whether each and every monument should be in the list or not, that will be very cumbersome and will cause considerable delay in protecting the monuments, and I hope the hon. Member will not press that point. In fact, there is no amendment, I do not think it is necessary to have a Select Committee just to consider that point.

Then, he also raised objection to clause 13 of the Bill. I would like to inform the hon. Member that clause 13 corresponds to section 10 of the Act of 1904, and no new power is being given to the Government. In fact the Land Acquisition Act has been in existence since 1894 and it is only proposed that the provisions of this Act should apply. He also referred to export of antiquities. Section 7 of the 1904 Act is covered by the Antiquities Control Act of 1947, and therefore for that reason it has been omitted. I have got that matter carefully examined.

Dr. Raghubir Singh: I have already indicated what portions have not been covered. I know what portions have been covered and I have already said so.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The provisions which have been made in his Bill, the Antiquities Control Act and the Treasure-trove Act, if we read them together I do not think it is possible for anyone to take away any of the antiquities from here or allow them to be destroyed.

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee raised objection with regard to the words 'preservation' and 'national'. Any monument which is to be protected in the interest of the whole nation is a national monument, and I was rather surprised that he raised that objection. I really failed to understand the very subtle argument which he advanced in this connection. As regards the word 'preservation', that is the word used in the 1904 Act also, and I think it is more comprehensive than the word 'conservation'.

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee: The Oxford Dictionary might help you.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The law is there. Since 1904 we have been using that word.

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee: My point is that a slight modification would make the English far better. 'Conservation' applies to a dead

antiquity. We are still in the midst of schemes for the 'preservation' of wild life. The word 'preservation' is far an extinct race.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Well, Sir, I am afraid I cannot agree with the hon. Member. In fact, in law we should be guided by practice and that word has been in existence since 1904.

Shri Kishen Chand: May I know from the hon. Minister what word is used in England or in America?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I am afraid I cannot give that information to the hon. Member.

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee: Well, Sir, my main point was with regard to 'denominational' – the monuments which are protected are strictly denominational – and you have also a clause regarding the free entry of people into those places of worship which are living places of worship. You are creating communal problems.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Sir, I had already drawn the attention of the hon. Member that as far as that clause is concerned, we are not making any new innovation. That already exists in the old Act of 1904.

Now, Sir, some question was raised with regard to the training of archaeologists. I would like to inform the House that the Government have under consideration a scheme for starting a Central School of Archaeology, and I hope when that scheme materialises, we shall be able to train officers who can carry on this supervision and excavation work more efficiently.

Some members and my friend, Mr. Kishen Chand, also raised objection with regard to the clause regarding those monuments which cease to be of national importance. Well, Sir, there can be occasions when a particular monument may fall down in an earthquake or may get washed away in a flood. Now, cases like those are expected to be covered by that clause.

So, Sir, these are some of the objections which were raised by Members, and I have tried to answer most of them. I am not convinced that there is any need for referring this matter to the Select Committee. That is why I was anxious to find out from my friend, Dr. Raghubir Sinh, if he had any controversial issues which ought to go to the Select Committee. This Bill has already been over-delayed and I would therefore like to get it through as quickly as possible so that we may implement this Act and carry on the work of protection and maintenance of national monuments.

Various Members referred to the great need of protecting the national monuments. Sir, I would like to assure the House that the Government are fully aware of this need and we have also requested the State Governments to enact legislation. As I told the House the other day, some of the State Governments have already enacted legislation. I said that the Governments of Orissa and Uttar Pradesh had already enacted legislation in this matter, and I had mentioned that Bombay and West Bengal had prepared the necessary Bills and they were waiting to be introduced. That was a slight mistake. I should have said that the Bombay Government have got their Bill prepared and are waiting to introduce it in the Legislature, while the West Bengal Government have not only drafted the Bill but also got it passed by both Houses of the State Legislature. Now, I hope the other State Governments will also follow the example of these State Governments, and it would be our constant endeavour to protect these national treasures. I thank the hon. Members once again for having participated in this debate and for having made valuable suggestions which would be fully taken into account.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The question is:

“That the Bill to provide for the preservation of ancient and historical monuments and archaeological sites and remains of national importance, for the regulation of archaeological excavations and for the protection of sculptures, carvings and other like objects be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Now, we shall take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clause 2 – Definitions

Shri H.D. Rajah: Sir, I want to move my amendment.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: But it came only this morning. So it is out of time.

Shri H.D. Rajah: But where is the need to bar me from telling something about the amendment? I gave it yesterday and it is there in the morning. But where is the need for barring me like this? If the House agrees, I can move it now.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Even if a single Member objects, I have to rule it out. I will put it to the House.

Is the House giving permission to move his amendment?

(No hon. Member dissented)

Mr. Deputy Chairman: So, I take it that there is no objection. All right, Mr. Rajah, you can move your amendment.

Shri H.D. Rajah: Sir, I move:

4. "That at page 2, at the end of line 18, after the words 'one hundred years' the words 'but does not include any statue or other object commemorating, or associated with, the British regime in India' be inserted."

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The clause and the amendment are before the House.

Shri H.D. Rajah: Sir, this amendment categorically tells something which my friend, Dr. Shrimali, has accepted to some extent. I am very grateful to him for that much acceptance which he has expressed in this House. Those statues which offend our national sentiments will be removed from the public view or will not be used as part of preservation under this Bill. To that extent I am glad, I am grateful to him. The difficulty is to find out which of these statues offend our national sentiments and which do not offend our national sentiments. When my son goes about in the street, he sees statue of King George or of Queen Elizabeth or of General Dyer or of General O'Dyer. It is very difficult for him to distinguish between these celebrities, whose statues show that they did something in this country as if this country was their grandfather's property. I do not want to bring up my child under this feeling that there were these Johnnies ruling us and looting this country. It is obviously difficult for us, therefore, to make any distinction between one statue and another.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: He will read the history books.

Shri H.D. Rajah: I am not thinking of erasing the history in the books. I am not like certain people who think that by burning some history books, all history will be erased. These are embodiments to show to our children, to my children, that there was foreign rule in this country for a period of 150 years to 200 years. That must be obliterated.

Shri J.S. Bisht (Uttar Pradesh): You do not obliterate history.

Shri H.D. Rajah: I am only suggesting that it is a very difficult process to find out which statues offend our national sentiment and which do not. There was a statue of Lord Willington in Madras which according to the Government offended national sentiment. I would have smelted the whole thing and made copper wires out of it for electricity purposes. Instead of doing that, these people took it to the

museum in Madras and confined it there to some corner. I do not want a similar thing to happen with regard to the other statues in this country. What I say is that these statues are not part of history. They are the vainglorious attempts of the rulers here in this country, and there were lackeys here who helped them to perpetuate themselves in the form of statues. You say anything which has been there for not less than one hundred years. We are now in 1958. One hundred years back means 1858. Suppose somewhere in Northern India, somebody did something and got the bones of somebody and ultimately they were found to be the bones of a British soldiers who killed our brave soldiers of the 1857 revolt, and started keeping them as a monument in this country.

Shri P.D. Himatsingka: That is not the intention.

Shri H.D. Rajah: Suppose those bones are found to be those of a British soldier who was shot down by an Indian soldier. If these are to be preserved as a national monument, I must commit suicide on that day. It is not a matter I can consciously allow in any form whatsoever. Are these bones to be equated with those of Mogallana and Sariputta, the disciples of Buddha? This is what I want to know. Therefore, when such a law is passed, if you give any loop-holes for such things, it is not something which can be allowed. Therefore, as far as my persuasion will help, I would appeal to Dr. Shrimali, my very good friend, to accept this amendment and save our national honour.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: I want to say a few words in support of this amendment. I am grateful to the House for permitting this amendment to be moved. The fact that there was not a single Member objecting to it shows that the spirit and the wording of the amendment are acceptable to the hon. Members of this House. I hope the hon. Minister will kindly accept this amendment and incorporate it in the Bill. The hon. Minister was saying that they did not want to make a fuss about removing these statues. We are not asking them to make any fuss about it, except that it requires some people to go there and remove them. I do not know why it was said that they did not want to make any fuss about it. I think there are some other reasons as to why these things are not being done expeditiously. There are some elements in the Government who think that some of these statues should be retained in their present places, and that is why it is not being done. That is the main reason. Otherwise, even after ten years of independence I regret to say that we are still having statues of the kind which should not be exhibited in public places. There should be some explanation about it. Now, you find how long it takes to build statues to our martyrs, martyrs who believed in the

Congress and who did not believe in the Congress. This takes time, and it is not being done. But at the same time we find that these statues of our oppressors, our enslavers, are displayed in public. Now, we are told that history has to be preserved. This is not a matter of history. I should have thought that the poverty and suffering of India was enough testimony to the history of British rule here, and we do not require to perpetuate that shameful and horrible history by keeping these statues in their present places. It is a strange way of perpetuating history to suggest that these statues should remain. This is not the history of India. It is the history of those people who came here and conquered our country and plundered and looted it, and remained in occupation of this country breaking all good tenets of history, all the norms of history and all the rules of civilisation. If I were to find any place for them, it will be in a chamber of horrors. Let us create a chamber of horrors in our country and removal of all these statues and similar things there and keep them there so that the people would remember the horrible history that the British gave us. That should be the approach. Please do not say that history is being perpetuated by preserving them. Do not raise any historical grounds in order to justify the conduct of the Government in this.

Calcutta, you see, has still some statues. People do not like to look at them. There is only one paper. *The Statesman*, which writes editorials in support of keeping such statues in their present places. Except that most other newspapers in the country have expressed themselves against the continuance of these statues in their present places. Public opinion is thoroughly against it. Still you find them here in Delhi. You cannot go about the city without coming across some statues, some standing on horses and some standing with elaborate robes with some insignia or other. Well, what do they perpetuate? What do they recall to mind? What do they signify to us? Were they put up there for art? Or for culture? They were put up there to exhibit their rule over this country. They are the legacies of a shameful and horrid past. They should be dynamited, if necessary and removed from their places. This is how we view this matter. We have got enough culture here. We are not in need of such statues to display our art, our culture, our accomplishment in the various fields. We have got enough to present to the world as signs of Indian culture, of Indian civilisation. We can well do without these horrible things. Therefore, Sir, I would ask the hon. Minister to accept this very good amendment. Sentiments are no guide. Sentiments are expressed sometimes by Members opposite, only to be forgotten in practice.

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee: Were not Indians responsible for that history?

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: What does he mean by asking whether Indians were not responsible for that history? We are not concerned with that sort of thing here. I am not engaged on any dissertation on Indian history. There have been traitors in our country, and unfortunately some of them are rewarded in this present regime. We are ashamed of such Indians but they are very few. They are very very few. Those Indians who have made Indian history or are making it, their memories need to be commemorated. I have no objection to that. But don't try to recall those things. Therefore, I don't know why a veteran old historian of his stature sometimes fails to understand what is obvious to an infant.

Then Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would ask the hon. Minister to take steps, to take account or an inventory of all the statues all over the country and fix a target date by which these statues will have been removed and pass orders to the Government to remove the statues. If they think that they are lacking in technical skill or otherwise, let them appeal to the people and the people will know how to deal with these statues. Therefore I would again appeal to the hon. Minister to take concrete, practical, immediate steps so that this shame is completely erased out and is no longer visible before the generation that is growing up. We have had enough of it and we can do without them.

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: In view of the assurance which I have already given to the House, I don't think it is the intention of my hon. friend Mr. Rajah to press this amendment. My friend Mr. Gupta has referred to Indian culture. The whole of our culture is based on a spirit of toleration. We fought our war of independence in a spirit of non-violence and in a spirit of love.

Shri H.D. Rajah: You can remove these statues non-violently.

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: I have already told the House that we don't want to do anything which is inconsistent with our history and with our culture. I have already assured the House that we are removing these statues. None of the statues has been declared as monument of national importance and the Government have no intention to declare these offensive statues as monuments of national importance and I hope that this would satisfy the hon. Members. I would however like to say one thing, that is, whatever we do, we should do it in accordance with our culture and with our history, which are based on a spirit of toleration and spirit of love and not of hatred and intolerance.

Shri H.D. Rajah: In view of the assurance given by the hon. Minister that these statues will be removed from public view non-violently I withdraw this amendment.

Amendment No. 4 was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The question is:

“That clause 2 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 3 to 5 were added to the Bill.

Clause 6 – Preservation of Protected Monument by Agreement

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Sir, I beg to move:

3. “That at page 5, line 35, for the words ‘the owner shall’ the words ‘where the agreement is terminated by the owner, he shall’ be substituted.”

I have already explained the implication of this amendment.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The question is:

3. “That at page 5, line 35, for the words ‘the owner shall’ the words ‘where the agreement is terminated by the owner, he shall’ be substituted.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The question is:

“That clause 6, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 6, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 7 to 39 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1—Short Title, Extent and Commencement

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Sir, I move:

2. “That at page 1, line 5, for the figure ‘1957’ the figure ‘1958’ be substituted.”

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The question is:

2. “That at page 1, line 5 for the figure ‘1957’ the figure ‘1958’ be substituted.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The question is:

“That clause 1, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Enacting Formula

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Sir, I move:

1. “That at page 1, line 1, for the word ‘Eighth’ the word ‘Ninth’ be substituted.”

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The question is:

1. “That at page 1, line 1, for the word ‘Eighth’ the word ‘Ninth’ be substituted.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The question is:

“That the Enacting Formula, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

The Enacting Formula, as amended, was added to the Bill.

The Title was added to the Bill.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Sir, I move:

“That the Bill, as amended, be passed.”

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Motion moved:

“That the Bill, as amended, be passed.”

Dr. Raghbir Singh: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is with a genuine regret that I found that my friend Dr. Shrimali would not accept my submission and request for referring this Bill to a Select Committee.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: There was no amendment.

Dr. Raghbir Singh: In that connection my only submission is that these Bills are referred to Select Committees not necessarily if there is....

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Dr. Raghbir Singh, you did not table an amendment and I don't think you can refer to this matter in the Third Reading. You can only speak either for its rejection or for its adoption. You have not given any amendment.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: He starts with a note of regret that something was not done.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: He had a remedy and he could have tabled an amendment.

Dr. Raghubir Singh: You have ruled it out of order to make a few general remarks about the Bill as a whole.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Yes.

Dr. Raghubir Singh: Against the Bill as a whole, as I have already said in the beginning, I did not have many points for opposing it, but I feel that such an important Bill should have been given more thorough consideration and there should have been a more democratic method of consultation, discussion....

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I object to this word 'undemocratic'. I don't know what a more democratic method could be than having this Bill before the Parliament. The hon. Member never moved an amendment and now he suggests that we have followed an undemocratic method.

Shri P.D. Himatsingka: We have discussed it for two days.

Dr. Raghubir Singh: We have discussed it only for two days. I still feel that it would have been much better if we had provided that these notifications should have come to the House. When I made the suggestion, I did not necessarily mean that each of the notification has to be discussed here on the floor of this House but if the notifications are placed on the Tables of the two Houses, it gives the House an opportunity to take up the matter. It is true that whenever these notifications are published in the Government of India Gazette, they are known to all but they do not necessarily give a chance to Members of Parliament to raise a discussion on them. I press for that and I would still request the hon. Minister to consider that for the future; for we have always had a tradition of amending Bills coming in soon after a Bill is passed and that why I am making this suggestion again that a definite provision should be made that these notifications are placed on the Tables of the two Houses. For that will be in continuation and in conformity with the wishes of the Constituent Assembly and the wishes and desires of the States that the Parliament should have a real hand in this matter. Thank you, Sir.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Sir, I have nothing more to add to what I have already said on the subject.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Document No. 124

Azad and the Conference of the Presidents of the PCCs and the Leaders of Congress Legislature Parties

2-9-1955

A Conference of the Presidents of the PCCs and the Leaders of Congress Legislature Parties in the States was held on September 2, 1955 in the AICC Office. Shri U.N. Dhebar was in the Chair. The main item on the agenda was the issue of co-ordination between the Organisation and the Administration.

The Congress President addressed the Conference. Emphasising the need for maintaining proper co-ordination between the two wings of the Congress – organisational and parliamentary – he said that united action of the two sections strengthened the Organisation and created opportunities for service to the millions of people who had reposed confidence in it. He urged upon Congressmen to take a united stand and give a lead to the people who looked up to the Organisation for guidance and inspiration.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru next addressed the Conference. Speaking about the two wings of the Organisation, he said: "The Congress side of it should always be moving and should have a grip over the problems and should be active. Other parties in the country shoulder no responsibility. They just criticise and agitate about anything. Our responsibility is greater. That is why it becomes all the more necessary to keep in touch with the people. It is equally important that those in the administration should have their ears to the ground."

Shri Govind Ballab Pant said that the question of establishing a machinery for co-ordinating the activities of the Government and the Congress Committees had been raised from 1937 onwards. Considerable experience had been gathered in the meantime and some standards had been accepted in the form of conventions. Shri Pant was of opinion that

the Organisation was bigger than the Government itself, and naturally, it was to the Organisation that the Government would always look up for guidance and strength. He emphasised that both must go together. He felt that it was only the tactful handling and proper appreciation of human nature that would facilitate co-ordinated work and harmony.

The recommendations of the Committee, which had been appointed by the Working Committee to suggest conventions for establishing co-ordination between the Congress Ministries in the States and the PCCs, were placed before the Conference. They were unanimously endorsed.

(The report of the Committee consisting of Shri Govind Ballabh Pant, Shri Morarji Desai, Dr. B.C. Roy and Shri K. Kamaraj Nadar is given under the Central Parliamentary Board.)

PURITY AND STRENGTHENING OF THE ORGANISATION

While considering the resolution on "Purity and Strengthening of the Organisation" passed at Avadi, it was proposed that the Working Committee may set up a Standing Committee for making recommendations for implementing the resolution.

The question of appointment of the Standing Committee was considered by the Working Committee in March, 1955. The Congress President pointed out that there were three aspects of the Avadi resolution, *i.e.*, canalising the new enthusiasm and atmosphere, composition of the Committee and its terms of reference. The Working Committee considered the draft resolution on the subject. It was adopted as follows:

'During the course of discussion on the resolution on Purity and Strengthening of the Organisation, passed at the Avadi Session of the Congress, it was suggested that the Working Committee may appoint a Standing Committee for making recommendations for the implementation of the resolution.

The Congress is an association of voluntary workers. It neither offers a share in the spoils of office nor benefits resulting from governance of the country by a single party. The only attraction it can offer to an honest worker, who joins the Congress, is a share in shaping the destiny of this country, by serving the people with dignity and self-respect. The Congress can draw just satisfaction from the fact that it has been successful in generating a spirit of selfless service in this country. The Avadi resolution on the Socialistic Pattern of Society has created a new urge and a new wave of enthusiasm among Congress workers and the people. It is now necessary to divert the entire energy of the Organisation

into positive and constructive channels. With a view to encouraging this and securing the object of the resolution referred to above, the Working Committee appoints a Committee consisting of the following members:

1. Shri U.N. Dhebar – *Chairman*
2. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru
3. Shri Govind Ballabh Pant
4. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad
5. Shri Morarji Desai
6. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri
7. Shri Gulzarilal Nanda
8. Shri S.K. Patil, and
9. Shrimati S. Ambujammal (added later)

The terms of reference of the Committee, *inter alia*, will be:

(a) to prepare necessary literature on the social and economic objectives of the Congress Organisation;

(b) to prepare a scheme for imparting training to Congress workers;

(c) to suggest ways and means for the eradication of the spirit of casteism and communalism noticeable occasionally in the Organisation;

(d) to suggest ways and means by which women and unrepresented sections of society can be assured adequate representation in the Organisation;

(e) to suggest methods for raising the standards of efficiency in the Congress Committees;

(f) to suggest ways and means for more effective scrutiny of the active members in accordance with the rules and under the Constitution; and

(g) to suggest ways and means for a more homogeneous and harmonious working of the Organisation and the avoidance of the formation of groups within it.

Suggestions were received from various quarters and the matter was discussed in the Conference of the Presidents and Secretaries of the PCCs held in March, 1955. The Standing Committee went into all the suggestions and after a thorough consideration submitted the following report to the Working Committee:

The Standing Committee appointed by the Working Committee in accordance with the resolution on "Purity and Strengthening of the

Organisation" met on April 5, 1955. All the nine members of the Committee were present. Besides the members, the two General Secretaries attended the meeting.

The Committee considered the report of the Presidents and Secretaries' Conference as also the Note of the Congress President regarding 'Purity and Strengthening of the Organisation'. It was agreed that a positive approach to this question was the best approach. The Standing Committee also noted that meetings and conferences of the Workers were being held all over India to explain the Avadi resolution and the question of discipline is being approached from the angle of the Congressmen's role in the building up of a society conceived therein. The Committee was of opinion that it was necessary to lay down a certain broad outline for the guidance of the constituent bodies and the members of the Organisation. The Committee felt that instead of doing so separately, it would be better to include it in the literature on the social and economic objectives. The theoretical background would go a long way to convince the Committees and the members of the Organisation that a wrong or an incorrect piece of conduct or behaviour or action ultimately affected prejudicially the goal aimed at. In the preparation of literature, therefore, emphasis has to be put on those aspects of public life which militate against or are inconsistent with the social and economic objectives in view. The Committee felt that the Congress should set certain standards before Congressmen and women in general and active members in particular, which they were expected not only to fulfil so far as they themselves were concerned but also to further and advance in general as fundamental to the working of the Organisation. Violating these standards would automatically bring them into conflict with the social and economic objectives and, therefore, with the rules of discipline.

A consciousness should grow everywhere that it is the duty of every Congressman, in whatever walk of life he is, to give a lead to the rest of the people in achieving a constructive revolution in every field of social, economic and moral life, and that the sense of equality and earnestness he brings to bear upon his work will determine the quality of the revolution and the speed with which it is achieved.

With the above aim in view, the Committee decided to make the following recommendations to the Working Committee:

I. Membership:

(a) The constitutional provisions and the existing rules regarding enrolment of primary and active members, preparation of electoral

rolls, etc. should be rigorously enforced. The primary membership fee of annas four should be paid by the person out of his own earning, and in no case, should it be paid by anybody else except by his family members.

(b) the provisions regarding the submission of periodical report by active members and their scrutiny by the Scrutiny Committee should be strictly enforced.

Zonal Inspectors from the AICC should go round the various Pradeshes regularly to find out how far the rules and instructions of the Working Committee are being complied with, and particularly to make occasional sample scrutiny of primary and active members.

II. *Elections:*

(a) Attention of the Pradesh Congress Committee should be drawn to the desirability of holding the delegate elections and elections to various other Committees by show of hands in meetings to be called on the same date and at the same time in the various polling booths.

(b) As far as possible a person should not hold the same office in the Organisation for more than one term.

(c) The practice of a person holding a number of positions in the Government or Party should be discouraged. In any particular case reasonable limit can be determined by the Leader of the Party and the PCC President.

III. *Preparation of Literature:*

A Committee for the preparation of necessary literature on the social and economic objectives of the Congress should be appointed, consisting of:

Shri Gulzarilal Nanda

Shri K.P. Madhavan Nair

Shri Sriman Narayan – Convener.

with two other members to be nominated by the President.

The Committee should have the power to coopt additional members.

The Committee should get the approval of the Standing Committee before publishing the literature.

IV. *Training of Workers*

The scheme for imparting training to Congress workers should be followed by the PCCs.

V. Elimination of Casteism:

(a) (i) An active member of the Congress should not be a member of any caste or communal organisation:

(ii) He should not associate himself with any activity carried on by or in the name of a caste, unless the activity be of a religious character or connected with the uplift of scheduled castes or tribes or is expressly for removal of anti-social customs;

(iii) He should not participate in caste dinners, caste parties, customary caste meetings or conferences; and

(iv) He should not associate himself with any caste institution connected with educational or other beneficial activities like schools, colleges, hostels, etc. unless that institution is open to all sections of the society without any distinction of caste or community.

(b) Inter-caste and inter-communal marriages should be encouraged.

(c) The Central and State Governments should be requested to stop State grants or assistance to caste and communal institutions.

(d) The Working Committee should given the power to suspend any Committee or member of the Legislature who is encouraging in one form or other casteism in the Congress Committees or in the Legislature or in the Cabinet.

VI. Representation of Special Elements :

The percentage of nominations to the various Congress Committees should be raised from 5 to 10 per cent. Out of this 10 per cent. at least 5 per cent. should be reserved for women.

The nominations to the PCCs and DCCs should be made by the general bodies and not by the Executive Committee as provided in the Constitution.

VII. Avoidance of Formation of Groups:

The Working Committee should take steps to ensure a more homogeneous and harmonious working of the Organisation and the avoidance of formation of groups within it. The Working Committee, on being satisfied that groups exist in any PCC or DCC, should direct the leaders of both groups and such other active members thereof, if any, to show cause why they should not be suspended from participating in the affairs of the Organisation. The Working Committee should after considering such explanation, decide in each and every case what action should be taken to eliminate the groups and the decision so taken should be final.

The Working Committee should have the power to order the dismissal of persons when it is satisfied that the groups are formed for futhering the interest of a particular caste or community or for capturing power in the administration.

The above report was considered by the Working Committee in May, 1955. The Working Committee ratified it and decided to place it before the AICC meeting at Berhampur.

While giving its general approval to the recommendations of the Standing Committee, the AICC stressed thence for prompt and effective action to eradicate groups casteism and communalism. The AICC expressed the hope that Congressmen in general and Congress Committees in particular, would give their fullest cooperation in the important task of purifying and strengthening Organisation.

APPENDIX 2

Document No. 125

Answers Dated 11-2-1958, of Dr. Shrimall (on behalf of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad), to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha

ENGLISH TEACHING EXPERTS SENT BY THE BRITISH COUNCIL

Shri Nawab Singh Chauhan: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that some English teaching specialists sent by the British Council are coming to India;

(b) if so, how many;

(c) when they will come and where they will work;

(d) whether it is also a fact that some officers are also coming on behalf of the British Council for the Central Institute of English Education at Hyderabad; and

(e) if so, what are the terms on which these persons are coming and who will bear their expenditure?

Shri T.S. Pattabiraman: May I have the answer in English since it concerns English?

Mr. Chairman: The matter is still under consideration.

Shri H.D. Rajah: Will the hon. Minister tell us whether the Government contemplate sending out Indians to teach English in England and other countries? We have experts in our country to teach English. I want to know whether the Government are taking steps to send out people from this country who are proficient in English?

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: If an invitation is sent to us, we shall certainly consider.

APPENDIX 3

Document No. 126

Answers dated 11-2-1958, of Dr. Shrimali (on behalf of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad), to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha

HIGH SCHOOLS IN CHAMBA DISTRICT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH

Shri C.L. Varma: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) how many high schools are there in the Chamba District of Himachal Pradesh and where these schools are located; and

(b) whether the Himachal Pradesh Administration has provided suitable Government premises for these schools?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: (a) and (b) The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House in due course.

APPENDIX 4

Document No. 127

Answers dated 11-2-1958, of Dr. Shrimall (on behalf of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad), to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha

JOURNALS PUBLISHED BY THE SAHITYA AKADEMI

Shri Amolakh Chand: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Sahitya Akademi is publishing any journals; if so, what are their names; and

(b) what are the languages in which they are published?

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: (a) Yes, Sir. The Akademi is publishing only one journal entitled 'Indian Literature'.

(b) In English only.

Shri Amolakh Chand: May I know whether the Akademi has decided to publish this journal in any of the 14 languages or whether it has delegated the publication in regional languages to the various States which have only literary academies?

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: At present the Akademi has no proposal to publish this journal in any of the other languages. It is being published in English only.

Shri Amolakh Chand: At the time when the decision was taken to publish this journal, what was the budgeted amount for this journal, and may I know whether any editorial board has been attached to this journal?

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: Yes, there is an editorial Board. The expenditure I think that the hon-Member asked for the expenditure — will approximately be Rs. 10,000 for two issues per annum.

Shri Amolakh Chand: How many issues have been issued so far?

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: One issue so far, and 3,000 copies of the first issue have been published.

Shri H.D. Rajah: Will the hon. Minister kindly say whether any equivalent of the word 'Academy' is there in Tamil, and if so, the name that is used in publishing a journal in Tamil in the name of this Akademi?

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: This question does not arise out of this question.

Shri Jaswant Singh: May I know whether this journal is published for sale to the public and, if so, its price?

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: The price per single copy is Re. 1, while the annual subscription is Rs. 2.15 inclusive of postage.

Shri Amolakh Chand: May I know whether a copy of the journal has been placed in the Parliament's Library or supplied to the Members of Parliament?

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: Copies of the first issue have been distributed to the Members of Parliament. That is my information. If the hon. Member has not got it, he may kindly let me know.

Shri Amolakh Chand: I could not find it in the Parliament Library. May I know whether it is published for internal consumption or external consumption?

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: Both for internal and external consumption.

APPENDIX 5

Document No. 128

Answers dated 11-2-1958, of Dr. Shrimali (on behalf of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad), to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha

SURVEY OF EDUCATION FACILITIES IN VILLAGES

Shri Amolakh Chand (On behalf of Shri Mahabir Prasad): Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to refer to the reply given to Started Question No. 51 in the Rajya Sabha on the 20th May 1957, and state:

(a) whether the survey has since been carried out to find out village-wise population and education facilities existing therein;

(b) whether it is a fact that some large villages have no education facilities while smaller ones have more than one school; and

(c) If so, what steps are being taken to remove such anomalies?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: (a) The Survey is being carried out;

(b) Cases of this matter, if any, will be highlighted by the survey; and

(c) State Governments have been advised to locate new schools on the basis of the survey results.

Shri Amolakh Chand: May I know, Sir, the places where this enquiry is being conducted and whether the State Government are conducting it in their individual states or whether the Government of India is conducting it in those States?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The State Governments are conducting it. The Government of India is assisting them.

Shri Amolakh Chand: May I know, Sir, the persons employed in this investigation in the State of Uttar Pradesh and how much time would be taken to cover the state of Uttar Pradesh?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: As far as the field work of collecting the information is concerned, it has been completed in most of the States

except in the States of Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, West Bengal and Himachal Pradesh. The field work has been completed.

Shri Amolakh Chand: Has any action been taken on the reports which have been received from other States than those from where the information has not been received?

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: The State Governments have been asked to take the necessary action as soon as the survey is completed in their states.

Shri Amolakh Chand: Has the Government of India any information about any steps taken by any State or not?

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: The whole survey is expected to be completed by the 30th June and then we shall be in a position to know what action is being taken by the State Governments.

APPENDIX 6

Document No. 129

Answers Dated 11-2-1958, of Dr. Shrimali (on behalf of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad), to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha

OPENING OF VELLORE PORT TEMPLE FOR PRAYERS BY PUBLIC

Shri D.A. Mirza (On behalf of Shri P.S. Rajagopal Naidu): Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to refer to the answer given to Starred Question No. 385 in the Rajya Sabha on the 11th December, 1957, and state the reasons for not permitting the Hindu public of Vellore to offer prayers in the Jalakanteeswara temple, even though the Government of Madras has recommended the opening of the temple for public worship?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: At the time the Vellore fort was taken over by the Government of India for protection under the Ancient Monuments Preservation Act 1904, such worship was not being carried on there and the policy of the Union Department of Archaeology is not to allow the starting of worship in monuments which have not traditionally been the venue for such worship immediately prior to protection.

Shri D.A. Mirza: Is it not a fact, Sir, that the Government of Madras recommended the opening of the temple for public worship and, if so, why that recommendation was not given effect to?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Yes, Sir, the Madras Government had requested us, and I have already replied with regard to the policy of the Government of India in this matter.

Shri D.A. Mirza: Is it the policy of the Government of India to restrict worship in public places?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: No, Sir, I have already stated the policy of the Government of India, which the hon. Member might care to look into, and it is "not to allow the starting of worship in monuments which have not traditionally been the venue for such worship immediately prior to protection."

Shri D.A. Mirza: Were there no prayers offered there in those days before the Government of India took it over?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: No, Sir.

Shri H.D. Rajah: Is it a place of worship or not? But from the answer given by the hon. Minister I am inclined to think that it is only archaeological stuff and not a thing fit to be worshipped? Is it so that there was no worship when the Government of India took it over?

Mr. Chairman: Questions are over.

APPENDIX 7

Document No. 130

Answers Dated 11-2-1958, of Dr. Shrimall (on behalf of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad), to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha

RELAXATION OF QUALIFICATIONS FOR A PRINCIPAL OF A HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL IN DELHI

Shri C.L. Varma: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state.

(a) whether it is a fact that the minimum qualifications prescribed for the post of a Principal of a Higher Secondary school in Delhi have recently been revised:

(b) whether the revised qualifications have been brought into force with effect from the 29th August, 1957.

(c) if so, what was the number of unqualified Principals officiating before that date whose cases for relaxation from requirements as to the minimum qualification were under consideration;

(d) to which of the institutions each of them belonged;

(e) for how long each of them had officiated as a Principal; and

(f) whether in any of these cases exemption had previously been refused?

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) to (f) A statement is laid on the Table of the House. (See Appendix XX, Annexure No. 1.)

APPENDIX 8

Document No. 131

Answers dated 11-2-1958, of Dr. Shrimali (On behalf of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad), to the questions asked in the Rajya Sabha

CO-ORDINATION OF UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

Shri J.H. Joshi: Will the Minister of Education and Scientific Research be pleased to state whether there is a proposal under Government's consideration for the coordination of the University education?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The University Grants Commission have set up a Committee to make recommendations for the maintenance and coordination of the standard of University education.

APPENDIX 9

Document No. 132

**Questions and answers in the Lok Sabha dated 29-4-1958
in connection with the Mausoleum of
Maulana Abul Kalam Azad**

Shri D.C. Sharma:

Shri A.M. Tariq:

Shri Bhakt Darshan:

Shri Nek Ram Negi:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether any decision has been taken by the Government of India with regard to the construction of a mausoleum in memory of Maulana Azad;

(b) whether any other steps are being taken to perpetuate his memory; and

(c) if so, the nature thereof?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (Shri Sadath Ali Khan): (a) In view of the location of Maulana Azad's tomb in front of the Jama Masjid, it is not proposed to erect any elaborate structure there. It is intended to have a garden round about the tomb as well as on the other side of the approach road to the Jama Masjid.

For the present, a simple temporary but artistic covering will be put up for the tomb. The further question of any permanent arrangement will be considered later.

(b) and (c) It is understood that the Working Committee of the Congress have issued an appeal for a fund with the object of honouring the memory of Maulana Azad. A copy of this appeal is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [See Appendix, VIII, Annexure No. 47.]

The Sahitya Akademi intends to bring out a collection of Maulana Azad's writings. Steps are being taken to collect all his writings from his early days.

Shri D.C. Sharma: May I know how long it will take for the committee to determine the kind of mausoleum which is mentioned in the reply given by the Parliamentary Secretary?

Shri Sadath Ali Khan: The Working Committee has already proposed certain steps which should be taken for this. I think it appeared in the newspapers.

Shri T.K. Chaudhari: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary has referred to an appeal of the Congress Working Committee. The question was intended to elicit information as to what steps Government have taken. Since when has the Congress Working Committee become the Government?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member can leave the Congress Working Committee alone. The Parliamentary Secretary could easily have said: These are the steps that Government are taking. Other persons who are interested are also taking steps. Whether outsiders take steps or insiders take steps, it is a memorial in memory of the late Maulana Sahab. Therefore, he has given outside information to us but not to give increased importance to the Congress Working Committee, so far as this House is concerned. Any contribution from any other source also is welcome provided it fits into the scheme.

Shri Yajnik: I want to ask if in response to the appeal of the Working Committee an all-parties Maulana Azad Memorial Committee has not been appointed and funds are being subscribed by all the Members of this House for a portrait. So, it is no use saying that it is the Congress Working Committee or the Congress that is trying to unveil a portrait of Maulana Azad in the Central Hall.

Mr. Speaker: There is no reference to Maulana Azad's portrait here. So far as it is concerned I know that all the parties have joined together and are presenting the portrait to be kept in the Central Hall. I understood this to mean the outside memorial. This has reference to the tomb and so on and not to anything inside the Parliament House.

Shri D.C. Sharma: How many meetings have been held of any committee appointed by the Government of India to implement the decisions which have been taken, the decision to grant scholarships, to establish libraries etc.? Has any implementation been made so far?

Shri Sadath Ali Khan: The appeal was issued only recently. I am not aware if any meetings have taken place so far.

Shri Ansar Harvani: Is the Government aware that a number of writings of Maulana Azad are being printed and published without any

authority in Pakistan; and if so, what steps have Government taken against those persons?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may give suggestions; I will allow the suggestions. But what steps can be taken to prevent them from publishing the writings?

Index

A

Abdul Hamid, 77
Abdul Salam, 3
Achaw Singh, 29
Agrawal, 196
Agrarian Reform 189
Ahmedabad, 166
Aiyer, T.A.A., 171
Algurai Shastri, 154
Al-Azhar, 61
Al-Hilal, 73
All India Congress Committee, 74, 144,
153, 178, 180, 182, 224
America, 122
Amolak Chand, 50, 53, 55, 191, 202, 244
Amrit Kaur, Rajkumari, 52
Amritlal (Thakkar), 165
Ansar Harvani, 24
A.P.I., 124
Arabic, 151
Arumugham, S.R., 38
Asaf Ali, 95
Asia, 82
Attlee, C.R., 85, 128
Awasthi, 12
Azad, Abul Kalam, 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12,
13, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 29, 30, 31, 38,
39, 40, 45, 48, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 59, 60,
61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71,
72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 80, 81, 84, 85, 86,
87, 88, 89, 93, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101,
102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109,
110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 118, 119,
120, 122, 124, 126, 128, 130, 132, 134,
135, 137, 138, 139, 143, 144, 145, 146,
147, 150, 161, 163, 167, 169, 170, 175,
178, 180, 185, 190, 192, 195, 200, 203,
209, 214, 219, 225, 300, 302, 307, 308,
309, 310, 311, 313, 315, on behalf of
241, 310, 311, 313, 315, 316, 317;
Tributes to, 236.

Aziz Hasan Baqal, 99

B

Banaras Hindu University, 12, 17
Bande Matram, 153
Bardoloi, Gopinath, 112
Barua, Hem, 15, 23
Basrurkar, V.A., 58
Basu, B.N., 73
Bhan, D., 58
Bhatt, Gokulbhai, 160
Bishwanath Roy, 15
Bose, Subhas Chandra, 93
British Cabinet Mission, 127
British Commonwealth, 136, 140

C

Cabinet Mission, 127, 134, 135, 141, 148
Calcutta, 115, 130
Central Youth Board, 189
Chakravorthy, Renu, 28
Chamanlal, 241
Chauhan, Nawab Singh, 306
Chawdhary, H., 157
Congress Democratic Front, 174
Congress Legislators, 122
Congress Party, 127
Contemporary India, 140
Constituent Assembly, 140, 147
Cripps, Stafford, 146
C.S.I.R., 21

D

Dada Dharmadhikari, 157
Dage, V.K., 267, 280, 284
Darshan, Bhakta, 38
Das, Govind, 153, 152
Das, M.M., 21, 22, 45, 47, 48, 49, 72
Das, Narayan, 22

Democratic Front, 166, Lines, 25
 Deo, Shankarrao, 156
 Delhi, 1, 19
 Desai, Morarji, 153, 157
 Dev, B., 242, 251, 288
 Dhebar, U.N., 229

E

East Asia, 82
 Easwara Iyer, 19
 Education Minister, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 24
 Egypt, 77
 Elayerperumal, 40, 41, 42
 Election Manifesto, 161
 English, 151, 245
 European, 139

F

Five Year Plan, 184
 Formula of Congress, 135
 French Revolution, 59

G

Gadgil, N.V., 192, 197
 Gaikwad, B.K., 29, 47
 Gandhi, M.K., 65, 146
 Gaur, R.B., 51
 Gautama, Mohanlal, 159
 Godavari District, 174
 Governor, 131
 Gupta, Bhupesh, 264, 287, 293, 295, 297
 Gupta, Sadhan, 8

H

Hafiz Ibrahim, 212
 Hanumatayya, H., 153
 Hasda, Subodh, 6, 7, 22, 35, 45, 46, 48
 Heda, 24
 Himatsingka, 293
 Hindustan, 186
 Hindus, 82

Hirey, B.S., 164
 Hyderabad, 184
 Hynniewta, 33

I

Ibn-i-Qayyim, 78
 Ibn-I-Saud, 78
 Ibn-i-Taimiah and Ibn-i-Qayyim, 78
 Iqbal Singh, 9, 10
 Iman, 73
 Indian Communists, 84
 Indian Culture, 60
 Indian Hands, 75
 Indian National Army, 95
 Indian National Congress, 107, 122
 Aglamic learning, 78

J

Jagjivanram, 163, 172
 Jain, A.P., 233
 Jaipal Singh, 26, 64
 Jama Masjid, 68
 Jana Gana Mana, 156, 159
 Jhulan Sinha, 14
 Jinnah, M.A., 129, 133, 150
 Joshi, M.B., 258, 278
 Jyotlishi, J.P., 22

K

Kairon, Pratap Singh, 168, 202, 206
 Kanga Ram, 156
 Kapoor, Prithviraj, 56
 Karanchi, 122
 Kashmir, 154
 Kadiyan, 14
 Kripalani, J.B., 62, 65
 Kripalani, Sucheta, 156
 Krishnan, P., 28
 Krishnamachari, T.T., 177
 Krishnarao, M.V., 13
 Kuala Lumpur, 186

Kumaran, 16
Kumbhar, 36
Kunzru, H.N., 56

L

Lal Bahadur (Shastri), 175
Lal, R.S., 34
League, Muslim, 83
Lok Sabha, 45, 48, 51, 53, 54, 58, 68
London, 119, 137
Lucknow, 137, 151

M

Madras, 243
Majhi, R.C., 21
Malabar, 190
Mathur, H.C., 14
Mehta Balvantray, 197
Mahtab, H.K., 177
Mehta, J., 197
Mehta, Pushpawali, 160
Menon, M., 19
Mookharji, R.K., 272, 273, 274, 277, 278,
289, 290, 295
Mukharjee, B.K., 51
Murthy, B.S., 39
Muzumdar, Dharendra, 157

N

Nadar, Kamraj, 153
Naidu, P.S.R., 53
Naik, Meheswar, 58
Nair, C.K., 19, 20
Nallamuthu Ramamurti, T., 58
Nanda, Gulzari Lal, 208
Narayanaswamy, R., 6
National Army, 81
Nayar, Sushila, 30
Nehru, Jawaharlal, 59, 67, 137, 145, 146,
161, 170, 179, 192, 208
New Delhi, 153, 156, 190, 192

Nigam, Savitry Devi, 51, 52, 57, 58
Nijalingappa, S., 153, 172, 176, 190
N.W.F.P., 131

O

Obaidulla, V.M., 71, 72, Maulana
Saheb, 72
Organisational lack (with Congress), 86
Orissa, 184

P

Pakistan, 133, 134, 135
Pangarkar, 31
Panigrahi, 23, 24
Pant, G.B., 69, 70, 145, 153, 154, 155, 161
Parmar, Y.S., 156
Patel, Manibehn, 171, 172
Patel, Sardar Vallabhbhai, 145, 156, 181,
204
Patel, S.K., 153
Prabhakar, Naval, 19
Prakaram, 170
Prasad, Bagvad, 156
Prasad, Rajendra, 174
Punnoose, 24
Pustake, T.D., 54

Q

Qadi Mohammad Shaukance, 78
Quit India, 145

R

Radha Raman, 20
Raju, V., 65
Ranakasbai, 27
Ranga, N.G., 26, 29, 162, 163
Rao, Thirumala, 15
Ray, N.R., 254
Reddy Sanjiva, 193
Ring Leader, 120
Roy, B.C., 153
Roy, J.N., 73

S

Sabha, Rajya, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12,
12, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28,
29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39,
40, 41, 42, 43, 55, 57, 69, 239, 307, 308,
309, 311, 313, 317

Sadulla, Sir, 112

Saigal, A.S., 2

Samanta, S., 21, 22, 45, 46, 48, 49

Sanganna, 11, 25

Sen, A.C., 38

Sharma, D.C., 1, 2, 14

Sinh, Raghbir, 50, 259, 260, 261, 262,
263, 264, 265, 268, 269

Singh, Raghunath, 23, 50

Singh Ram Subhag, 14, 16, 35, 50

Sinha, A.N., 178

Sitamarhi, 62

South Africa, 180

Shrimali, K.L., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10,
11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23,
24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34,
35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 50, 51,
52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 241, 242, 245,
262, 268

Sripakasa, 268

Syed Mahmood, 176

T

Tagore, R.N., 85

Tandon, P.D., 153

Tantia, R., 17, 18

Thangamani, 28

Tiwary, D.N., 46

Thompson, E., 133

Travancore-Cochin, 184

Tripathi, K., 182

Tunisia, 194, 195

U

U.G.C., 14, 25

U.K., 47

Ulema of Palestine, 77

UNESCO, 47

Unionist Party, 130

Urdu, 71, 101,

U.S.A., 47

U.S.S.R., 47

Uttar Pradesh, 133, 165

Uttar Pradesh Congress Committee,
165

V

Vanaspati, 158

Vasudevan Nair, 23

Venkatarao, Kala, 158

Vidharba, 164

Vindhya Pradesh Government, 186

Vishakhapatnam, 65

Vishvanathdas, 164, 172

Vyas Jainarayan, 174

W

Wasnik, Balkishne, 4

Wavell Plan, 80

West Bengal, 172, 264

White Paper, 141

Wodeyar, 16

World Assembly, 23

Working Committee, 90, 139, 141, 144,
178, 183, 190, 192, 209, 214, 219, 224,
225

Y

Youngman, 149

Youth of India, 147

Z

Zakir Hussain, 239